Godf. Blaxte

A Treatise against the preuee Masse in the behalfe and furtheräunce of the mooste hylye communyon, made by Edmund Gest

Reade gentyll reader and then iudge.

M: D. XLVIII

Cum Priuilegio ad Imprimendum Solum.

Imprinted at Londō in saynt Andrewes Pacyshe, In the Waredrop, By Thomas Raynald.

¶ Fautes escaped by ỹ prynter, reade in the secõd syde of ỹ fyrst leafe & .xiiii. line of b, exhibit: ue for exhitiue, & in ỹ thyrd leafe & secõd syde & fourth line rede not bread for bread, & in the fourthe leafe & last lyne of ỹ secõd syde, rede and for er, & in the fykt leafe & fyrst syde & .r biii. lyne rede geuing sacramẽtes for sacramẽtes gyuen & in the .bi. leaf fyrst syde & secõd lyne, rede lest for est, & in ỹ secõd syde of ỹ same leafe & .r. lyne rede ok for yk, & in the .xiiii. line seable for seble, & in ỹ .bii. leafe fyrst syde & xi ii. line, rede auouch for whych, & in the last leaf & syde, reade Baptisme for baptise, and in ỹ .xiiii. line termed for turned.

To the righte worshipful maister Cheke, scole maister to the Kynges maiestie, and prouost of his worthy colledge in Cambridge, Edmund Gest wysheth enteir health both of body and soule.

NOt wythstandynge (ryght worshipfull) I haue attempted an enterpryce in prouynge eche parcel of the pryuye masse to dysplease god, whiche I can neyther word, matier, ne reason accordynglye, and so am rather dyslyked then lyked of manye for thys my doyng, rather heady then heedy as they suppose: Howebeyt in case the sayd persons woll wythe me earnestly respect my bounden

deutye

deutie in the sayd doyng, they (I doubte not (woll be rather contented then discontēted with me for the same. For why: it is godes oppen wyll that not they alone, whom he hath mercifully delyue
Mat.xxv. red ten or fyue talentes vnto, but they also, who haue freelye receaued at hys mercye handes, but one talent, shuld occupy the same, to hys most auauntage, & not enwrappe it (to his great hinderance) in a napkyn. Lesse he wolde therfore withdraw it from them, and delyuer it to the well occuppers, either of the fyue or ten talentes heretofore especyfied (A clear ensample wherof is for our learning recorded i Math.xxv) Bycause wherof, albeit I am but slēderly knowledged i scriptur matters in respect of others, whose knowledge is ten or fyue talentes too myne one, & so am not hable to auale and gane therwith any thig

so much, as they wthers, who ar passingly skylled in the mattiers before said: This not withstādig I must occupy my talent & auantage so much therby vnto ỹ lord, as I can possyble, to the full discharge of my bonden dew herin, otherwise straitely charged with al. For we must all become accomptable to ỹ dreadful lord for our receipt & stewardship. Who so fayth Christe, is not faithful in a lytle is not trusty i moch. We must al be busely occupied tyl he come, eche man in his call accordyngly No man must attempt to appear before hym whithoute hys offre, more or lesse, according to his hablenes herein, which he estemeth, and not ỹ value & bygnes of the offredge. Though the sely poore wydowe offred but two mytes into ỹ lordes cheast, yet was she no lesse regarded of hym therfor, thē the great rych men, who offred in

luke. xvi.

luke. xvi

Math. 24.

Deut. xvi.

luke. 21.

to the same much more. Eche man (sayeth Hierome) offreth in to the lordes house what he can, Some golde, syluer & pcyous stone, Some eyther gotes skinnes, or ỹ heares of the same. For ỹ lord nedeth all these, And he is egally pleased with them, who haue vnegally offrede. In respecte wherof I haue offred vnto hym, this my symple poor myte or goate heare, trustig he wol of hys mercye, both accept ỹ same, & occasion hereby others, to wryte more groundely & clerkly in thys matteir, whych I haue chosen rather then an otheyr too ẽtreate vpon, In respecte ỹ treate therof is both right avaylable & nedeful l to hys churche, & so avãtageable to himselue, In ỹ it enforceth much to ỹ discontinuance & owerthrowe of ỹ pryuat masse, wherin we are most piteously blinded, to ỹ great dyshorshipe bothe

of

of our sauyour & hys moste holy
communyō. This myne attempt
(which as ye se, not of pride but of
mere conscience I am ēforced to)
not wythstandynge I haue of-
fred to the lorde: Houbeit I ensu
eng ỹ prayse worthy vsage of of-
ferers herein doo offre ỹ same to
som other beside, namely to your
worshipful mastership, not ỹ I ad
iudge it a p̄sēt, worthy your wor-
shyp, but ỹ I wold hereby opē my
poore harte toward your mayster
shyp, trustyng ye of your wonted
vnspeakeable gētlenes wol take it
in good parte, not respectynge so
muche the vylenes therof, as the
good mynde of the presenter of ỹ
same, who (vndoubtedly) hath p̄
sented, not all what he willyngly
wolde, but what hym hably could
theyrin. And thus I betake ye
to god, whom I most enterly be
seech to enuiron you w hys grace
so to

so to tread ȳ Kinges maieste in all
vertue, wisdome, and vnderstan-
dynge, as shalbe, kyȝste to the
hygh contentacion of god
selue, & furtherance of
hys trueth, second
ly to the Kinges
honour
and weale
of hys realmes,
lastelye too youre greate
worshyppe-name and
furtheraunce A-
men.

To the chriſti

an Reader euerlaſtynge gretynge in the Lorde.

VOlde god (dea tereader) ſoch a per ſon had attempted, and attempted, had perfected, and perfected, had openly publyſched & worthy diſcloſe and diſproue of the vnſufferable abhominatiō of the poppyſche priuate prpuy maſſe, an enterpryſe no leſſe nedeful than auayleable at al ſeaſons, and for all perſonnes, and namely at thys preſent, whyche is, thanke be vnto the lord God, ſo fauourable and benefyciall to the furtheraūce of the goſpell truth, and ſo preiudicial & hurt

full to the hinderance of the ſa-
me: who for hys worthy knowle-
ge perfectly knew, worthely &
conninglye, for hys hartie zeale
wolde earneſtlye, for hys boldē-
nes durſt openly, and for his elo
quence wold eloquently, and ac-
cordingly handel, and diſcouer
the ſayd vngodlynes, and worth-
emanly paynt the ſame before
thyne eyes. For why as it is
ryghte conuenable & behoueable that as eche vngodlye, and
exchueable vice, ſo the hertofore
mencyoned ydolatrie, or ymage
worſhyppe muſt of force be kno-
wen, and ſenſyblye dyſcloſed,
not onely for that it is a doying
both haynouſe and wycked, but
by reaſon it is alſo pretenſed &
cloked, wtyh the pretence and v-

ſurped

surped name of the Euãgelicall truthe, & recompted in maner of eche man, (thee moze pytye) for the wozthyest vertue, and for a wozshyp not to man alone, but to God also, mooste seruiceable and acceptable. To murder a gyltlesse persone, is a defaulte full greuouse, and thy selfe besyde, moch mozegreuouse, but not thy selfe alone, and an other but a greate compaignye of innocẽtes wythall, that is mooste greuouse of al. What sayd I mooste greuouse? Noo not so. For thee sayde murder compared wythe the slaughter of one pooze seely soule, is in respecte thereof, nothynge greuouse at all, By reason as one soule sourmounteth,

and

and passeth in worthines an in-
fynite number of bodies, so the
slaughter of one soule is more
greuouse, thã the murder of an
vnnumerable sorte of bodyes:
Howbeit the murder of sondrie
soules is more greuouse thã of
one, & so consequẽtly the slaugh
ter of an infinite sorte is passin
ge greuouse In respect wherof,
Oh what a greuouse cruel dede
is our solytary and alone mas-
singe, whych doeth murder not
the bodies alone (a wycked and
a cruel dede), but which is most
greuouse and wycked of al) the
soules also, not for a tyme, but
for euer: not to be without plea
sure and greuance, but to be in
endeles wofulnes, not of cer-
tayn of the worshippers & main
teners therupõ, but of e the one
wythout restraynt, onlesse he in

tyme

tyme become repētant, whether he be a prpue maſſer or a prpuate maſſe helper, whether he bee an hartie hearer or prpctour of the ſayd maſſe, ſo that in effecte he be a ſolytarye maſſe worſhipper, for as S. paule auoucheth not eupll workers alone, but they? appzouers and maynteyners, for that they be lyke mynded, ſhalbe lyke punyſhed, Yf the eatyng of an apple in paradyſe dyd worthely and meritorioullye ſlaye as queſtionles it dyd not bodely only, but ghoſtely alſo, not Adam alone but his wyfe alſo, & not thē alone but al they? poſterite, and that not for a tyme, but euerlaſtinglye, for & it was directely agaynſt the expreſſe commandemente of god, otherwyſe beyng nothing derogatorye to God or prciudicial Roma. 1

to man: Certaynlye then oure alone massynge, for so moch as it is not onelye a breache of gods open and holye commaundemente, as the eatynge of thee inhibited forbydden apple was, but an open ymage worshyp also, and a forged made seruice of god, whych is a default, no lesse haynouse than the sayd breache, yea, and moze too: doeth moche moze murder, aswel ghostely as bodely, not onelye the doers and kepers of thee priuate Masse, but thee vpholders also, and worshyppers there vpon, onlesse they hartelye, and that in thys presente lyfe repent them selues for the same. For a double fault, deserueth a double death a double damynatyon aswell of thee as

agreers and fauourers thereof, as of the authors, and doers, of the same. Is it not a wicked doynge to endamage an innocente bodye: and is it not a mysdede moche more wycked, to murder the same eyes verely. Thã remedyes here vpon gatherable, it is oure alone massing is a wyckednes vncomparable, By reason therein Christes bodye, whyche passynglye surmounteth all bodelye creatures, bothe in worthynes dignitie, and in acceptance wythe Godde is assayde daye by daye of thee alone Massers, to be mortefyed & done to death. In consideration (wherof) good Christian reader, I beseche thee by the precyouse deathe of oure alone Sauiour Iesu Christ embrase lowe and frequent onelye, the

the moſt ſacred cõmunion chriſ-
ſtes owne ordynaunce the true
maſſe, the true ſacrament exhi-
bitiue of chriſtes body & bloud,
the verye ghoſtely nurryture &
foode both of oure bodyes and
ſoules, into lyfe euerlaſtynge, &
vtterly eſchue auoyde, & deteſte
the priuate maſſe, thee vſurped
and falſe named communiõ, or
maſſe, the pretẽſed & conterfayte
ſacrament, mans ordynaunce &
tradycyon, the preſente poyſon
both of our bodies and ſoules,
into death not tempoꝛal alone,
but eternal alſo. What is ſacri
ledge that vnſyttyng haynouſe
and abhominable vyce, but an
embecilmente and ſtelthe of an
holy thyng out of an holy place,
whych is adiuged the moꝛe vn-
leyful haynouſe and abhomina
ble in reſpect of thee moꝛe holye
thyng

thynge embecilled, and stollen out of the moze holy place wher vpon it formally argueth oure pzyuate massing is a sactiledge mooste vnspytting, haynouse and detestable. Foz asmoch as it is a stelth of holye thinges, not of the baseste sute as candelstickes sencers, crosses and chalices be, but of the holyest and chiefeste kynde, namely of chziste, of the holy ghost, of true relygyon, of fayth, of godlynes, reposed and placed not in a stony temple oz aulter but in a chzistian & faith, ful hart which is iustly estemed moze pzectouse and holy than a thousād stone tẽpels oz aulters whych after thee repozt of paul is the temple of the holy ghoste & the mansyon place of the blessed trynitie, as chziste hym selfe witnesseth in Johā. The moze pzectouse

i. Cor. vi. Johan. 14

preciouse marriage, & more hay nouse default is the breach ther of. What marriage is in worthy nes to be compared wyth the spi rituall marryage, that is betwe ne christ and vs: Uerely none at all, By reason wherof our alone massinge muste remediesse be a mooste haynouse trespace. For that it disseuereth the sayd mar= riage and enforseth vs to whore with false goddes agaynst christ the lyuinge God oure spirituall husbande. Oh Lorde what an vnspeakeable and vncompara= ble vyce is thee Pryuee Masse. In case she dyd but murder mēs soules & bodies she were to wic= ked, but sythe she attēpteth thee, slaughter of the blessed bodye of christ, sythe she embecilleth & ta= keth out of our hartes christ the holy ghost, & theyr body & soule sauyng

sauing frutes, sithe she sõdereth and diuorseth the marriage betwene christ & vs: she must no remedy be vncomparably & vnspeakably wycked. Is it not a lamẽtable syght, to behold how hygh ly men esteme this pryuate masse whych mothereth so manyfolde and haynouse vyces? Is it not great pytye to see how she is suffered and frequented emongeste vs? Is it not a deadely remorse to respect the worthy clerkes in thys realme, and ỹ greate number of them, and yet not one to wryte agaynste hyr? Who yf they wold, could handle & vtter hyr accordingly? Yeas truli. Wel sythe they (who perfectly cã) wyl not wryte agaynst the sayd masse, sythe it is nedefull, that her synfulnes to longe dyssembled, should be openly vttered, sythe

A

sythe I am enforced in conscien
ce in thys greate vnseasonable
sylence emong ȳ great dyuines
in this behalf, to declare my sta
macke agayn here, I wil by god
des grace vndertake to wryte
agaynst the hertofore mencyo=
ned masse, notwithstãding I am
nothing fyt or sufficient to the
ful performaunce of so greate
an enterpryse occasyoned so to
luke, 19 do, through this the sayinge of
christ, yf my dysciples wyl hold
theyr peace the stones shal spea
ke wherby he doeth vs to wyt ȳ,
it is hys wyl & prouidence that
whan the learned refuse to sette
forth hys truthe, the vnlearned
shulde further and promote it:
Better it is somewhat to wryte
and enuey ghe agaynst the Po=
pyshe masse, and that grossly thã
not so godly nothing at al. Bet
ter it is

it is that the rude ignorant peo
ple shuld by my talke perceaue
somwhat of the sinfulnes of the
sayd masse, than through my si
lence nothynge at all', Better it
is that the sayd people shuld be
somewhat wythdrawē frō theyr
receaued masse errour, thā that
they shuld wholy after theyr ac
costumed wonte endure in thee
same. In respect wherof that
what I cā possible deuise to
the vtterāce and reproke
of the faultes incidēt
to thee pryuate
masse euē now
by gods assi=
stance do I
wryte.
Therfore good reader gyue
heedy attendaunce
therto:

PRyue masse after the doctryne of the Popishe boke entituled Antididagma is facyoned of fowre partes, namelye of thee Sacryfyce of Christes bodye and bloude, of the receypt of the communion of prayer, and of doctryne. These partes orderly wyl I declare and conferre them wyth goddes wrytten worde, vpon the conferēce and tryall whereof it shall (I doubt not) appeare ful true that eche parcel of the pryuate masse is vngodlye, and so consequently the masse selfe, exceadynge vngodlye.

The fyrste parte of the sayd masse is thee sacryfyce wherunto be incydente alwaye consecration

tion transubstanciation and the
worshippe of Christes body and
bloude. And by reason consecra
cyon for goethe transubstancia=
tion, and transubstanciation the
sacrylyce, and the worshyppe af
tergoethe them all: I wyll fyrste
talke vpon consecratyon, and
them orderly vpon the remnaun
te. Cōsecracyon is that percel of
the masse, wherein thee prieste pre
sumeth, to consecrat and hallow
Christes bodye and bloude. The
whyche, as it is an attempte too
vnreasonable and vnable so pas
synge wycked presumptuouse &
detestable. For howe can it possi
ble be that christes bodye whych
cannot be made holyer and per=
fecter thā already it is: shuld or
myght be consecrat of the prieste:
Thys muste nedes be that/that
is

is hallowed was before his cō=
secration. eyther throughly pro
phane & nothing holy at al, ey=
ther else not so holy, in consyde=
racyon wherof, whiles the prest
do presume to cōsecrate christes
body, nedes must they acknow=
ledge and graunt by that theyr
enterprise not so godly as pre=
sumptuouse that the sayd body
was before the consecration, ey=
ther nothyng holy at al, else not
so holy, which graunt as it is er
ronyouse and vnbeleueable so
vngodly and exchuable. In ca=
se the prestes presumed only by
theyr cōsecratiō to hallowe chri
stes body, that theyr cōsecratiō
were not so haynouse a dede, but
for asmoche as therby they con
tend not so learnedly as stoutly
not so truly as falsely. Christes
body to be forged and made of
the

the chosen bread, & therfore endeuour thē selues therby, to forge the body of ỹ purposed bread, it is exceding haynouse, for ther is no creature so worthy puissāt & entier, as ỹ sayd body is, why che thyng could not be true, yf ỹ prest or any mā else dyd or coulde make the same. For the ofte making of any thing as of chrystes body, is an vndeceyueable prouse of the vnperfytenes, vnworthines, & feblenes of ỹ same. Ther is no man, be he neuer so moch prested or byshopped ỹcā make the feblest basest, & vnperfytest creature in thys worlde, moch lesse chrystes body the perfytest & noblest creature, ther is no creature, be it neuer so imperfyte that is ofte made, howe thā can chrystes bodye be oft made, that is the most perfyte. These wordes take, eate, in these wor-

of ẏ institution of the lordes sup
per, take, eate thys is my bodye,
be no wordes of makinge of the
lordes body, but of presenting &
exhibiting the same to the recea=
uers of the ryghte supper of the
lord. So that it is full open that
the prieste can nether consecrate
Christes body, neyther make it.
Howbeit, this is alwaye graunt
able, ẏ minister both cōsecrateth
& maketh, thoughnot christes bo
dy & blond, yet thallotted bread
& wyne, ẏ sacramētes exhitiue of
the same. For where as ẏ bread
& wyne vsed at the lordes supper
were prophane & vnholy, before
the wordes of the institution of
the sayd supper were duely repor
ted vpon them, Nowe after thee
due reporte, and vtteraunce of
thee sayde wordes by thee myni=
ster, vpō the before named bread
and wine, they be consecrate and
made

made of prophane the holy sacra
mentes exhibitiues, of Christes
body and bloud. Thus also mea
ned the fathers by these wordes,
consecratiō and making in this
sacramente. Nowe to transub=
stantiatyon, or tornekynde, thee
next entreatable matter, whyche
is no lesse disallowable, then de=
ceaueable. How can thys stande
wyth our fayth that Christes bo
dy (whose creatyon is vnrenua=
ble) shulde be agayn made of the
bread a (vyle creature) throughe
therchaunge of the nature ther=
of into hys? Howe were it true ẏ
the blessed wyne: & broken bread
were bred & wyne, as Paule ter=
methe thē, yf theyr natures were
throughlye altered into christes
body & bloud? Can they be bread
& wyne styl, without they reteyg
ne theyr

Transubstantiatyon

they? natures styll: Can they be rightly named bread and wyne wythout they? own p?oper mater & substaũce in respect, where of they were so named: doo they not styll appere to oure senses, bread & wine, not withstanding, they ar become ỹ sacramẽtes exhibitiues of Chr?istes body and bloud: who euer sawe the exchãge of any substãce wout the alteraciõ of hys accedẽtes & outward shape? whẽ christ tourned marueylously water into wyne, it had not only ỹ nature of wyne, but the externall ko?me also, tast colour & tactiõ of wyne, & no semblance of water at al, Aarõs codde beyng altered into an adder, had not only ỹ substãce ther of, but also ỹ outward fassion of ỹ same & no similitude of a codde at al. The water which moyses chaunged into bloude, as it

was

was i nature bloud, so outward ly it semed bloud. Euē so questi onles shuld ỹ bread & wyne leaue ỹ outward shape wyth theyr inwarde substaūce, yt they were altered into chrystes bodye and bloud, By reason, wherof sythe they reteygne styl theyr accidentes, nedes must they also reteigne theyr wonted substance, can ther be any sacramēt as S. Augustyne sayth, without therin ỹ due elemēt, & fyt word of god be longinge ther vnto, be ioyntlye coupled togethers: No verely, How than can the outward apperaunce of bread & wyne without theyr inward substāce be ỹ sacramentes of chrystes body, & bloud, for ỹ outward apperaūce of bread & wyne be none elemētes, but only therternal shewes of the same. Elemētes be substāce & not accidētal shewes. Is it

not true, that in thee consacrate
bread, ther are wormes both en-
gendered & fostерd whych could
not be, yf ther endured the bread
lyke natured, after as it was be-
fore ꝑconsecration: For eche wor
me is a substance, and none accy
dent, therfore cannot be engende
red or fedde of an accydente, but
of a substaunce alone, In respect
wherof, sythe the wormes brede
and fede, not in Christes bodye,
but in thee consecrate bread, we
must remedyles acknowledge in
the same bread to contynue thee
verye proper substaunce therof.
The bread and wyne be sacrame
tes of Christes body and bloude
ordeyned of him purposely to en
structe oure senses outwardelye,
what is wrought inwardly by ꝯ
sayd bodye and bloud in the sou
le: For they vse is to declare too
our outward senses assuredly, ꝯ
as the

as the receaued bread and wyne norisshe, strengthen and glad our bodyes, so christes body eaten & hys bloud dronken accordyngly do oure soules. Howe coulde the bread & wyne serue to hys purpose, yf they were vtterly diuorced of theyr accostumed nature? Verely no maner wyse. For why? it is the alone substaunce of bread and wyne, and not ȳ colour taste facyon of the same, that fostereth and cherysheth the body. Sacramentes (sayth Augustyn) vnlesse they haue certayne lykelyhode wyth the thynges wherof they be sygnes, they be no Sacramētes at al. What semblance I beseche you is ther betwyxte the natureles bread aud wyne, and christes body and bloud? questionles none at all. For the sayde body and bloude, aud that after papysshe

doctryne

doctryne be not presented exhi
bited at the cõmunió accidẽtal=
ly but substãctially only. In re=
spect wherof nedes must we grãt
eyther the cõsecrãte bread & wy=
ne be not the sacramẽte of Chri=
stes body and bloud, whiche we
ought not to do, eyther else thee
sayd bread & wyne retеygne styl
theyr owne natures, whyche is
grantable. I maruel me muche
that many of thẽ, who stand in ỹ
defence of christes corporal pre=
sence at his supper, haue in ear=
nest meyntenaunce trãsubstãci=
ation, for as me semethe, it do=
eth moch, what hinder & preiudi
ce, the sayd presence of christ inỹ
sayd hys supper, by reason the
brokẽ bread & blessed wyne be in
stitute purposely to resolue and
ascertayn our senses that we as
materially & truly, thoughe not
grosselyer sensyblie, but ghostly
receaue

receaue and eate Chriſtes body
& drinke his bloud as we do the
kozelayd: In conſideratiõ wher
of yt we take, eate & drinke, but
the accidentes of ther kozelayde
bread & wine, & not the very ſub
ſtaunces of the ſame thẽ gather
able it were, chriſtes bodye and
bloud be not truely, but fayned
ly preſented & gyuen at hys ſup
per: For why yt the ſigne be coũ
terfayt & fayned, thẽ nedes muſt
the thing be in ſemblable ſorte,
whyche is betokened thereby a
true matter muſt remedyles ha-
ue his tokẽ alſo true. Inreſpect
wherof the brokẽ bread being ỹ
ſygne geuẽ of the ſayd body, is
material & not mattierles, thys
thenſuyng ſaying, which gracia
repoꝛteth, & fathereth vpõ Au-
ſtyne de cõſecrat diſtinct. ii, cap.
qui manducat, enſoꝛceth moche
to the dyſpꝛoue & dampnation,

of

of transubstanciation, That is
sene, is bread, and the cup wher-
of the eyes also make euidēt pro-
fe, but that that faythe demaun-
deth to be instructed in, is, that þ
bread is Christes bodye, and the
cuppe hys bloud. These therfore
be named sacramentes, for that
in them one thyng is seable, and
another vnderstande, that is, se
ne hath bodelye fourme that is
vnderstand hath ghostly fruyt
What can be more effectually a
expresselye spoken agaynste for-
nekynde, then thys the rehersed
Englysshed sentence of Augu-
styne? Fyrst he auoucheth therin
the seable matter to be bread, se-
condelye, for an vndeceaueable
argumente and tryall therof he
alledgeth the testimonye of thee
eyes, Thyrdly he sayth not that
is seeable is a bodelye fourme,
but

lbut hathe a corporall fourme,
este anye man shulde here be oc
casyoned too adiudge the mat=
ter to want in thys element and
so to remayne nothynge elſe but
thee outwarde and accydentall
shape of breade. For in that he
saythe that, that is seene hathe
a corporal fourme, he graunteth
in thee elemente twoo thynges
to bee remaynynge, thee thynge
hadde and thee thynge haupng,
thee outwarde fassyon whych is
seable and the subiecte and mat=
ter therof, it is to wytt the bread
substaunce and the escernall ap=
peraunce of the same. The sa=
cramente of Thankesgeuynge,
seythe Irenee consystethe vpon
twoo matters or substaunces,
thee one earthely, thee other hea
uenlye, Yt bread substaunce we

re

were departed thē could not Irenee leyfully call ẏ one part of the sacramēt a substaūce but an earthlye accidente. The worthy counsayl of Nece wryteth to the disalowaūce of trāsubstātiatiō in sorte thus, Let vs not grossely beholde the bread & wyne proposed & set before our eyes, but in faythe consyder the lambe, yf god in that hys sacred table hauing our hartes eleuate & vplifted, loe, here the worthy counsel nameth the feble portyon of the sacrament after the cōsecration bread & wyne, & not the formes of the same. Gelasius in open & expresse wordes impugneth the sayd transubstanciatiō as erronyouse & vncredyble in sorte as followeth. The sacramētes of ẏ body & bloud of christ, which we receaue ar sureli godly matters therfore through & by thē, we ar

made par

partakers of the godly nature,
& yet do they not ceasse to be the
substances of bread & wyne, but
cõtinue in ỹ properties of theyr
owne natures, wher as Justyne
sayth, ỹ lord doubted not to say
thys is my body, whẽ he gaue a
sygne of hys body: he meanethe
not that christes body is absen-
ted frõ hys supper, but that the
consecrate bread is not the sayd
body or turned substantially in
to the same, & is but the signe of
christes body, notwythstãdinge
it be named hys body. Notwith
standing Tertullian, Ambrose,
Jerome, Chrisostome, wythe o-
thers whyche expressly in theyr
wrytynges the consecrate bread
to represent Christes body, & to
be a signe therof, howbeit in tho
se & soch other, semblable theyr
speaches, theyr meanyng is not
that the sayd bread is denoided

of

of Christes bodely presence and presentment, but that the consecrate bread is but thee sacramentall sygne of christes bodye, and not christes body selue, thoughe it be termed sacramentallye the sayd bodye. Nowe wyll I assoyle certayne obiections, and gayn sayinges facyoned of the catholiques, a gaynst ẏ premysses. Yt say they) ẏ bred, nature were not tornekynded into christes body: why dyd he name it hys bodye? Can it be hys bodye, onles it be exchaunged into it? Cā I be you wythout I become your substance? No verely. No more can thee bread be christes body wythoute the exchaūge of the matter therof into the sayd body, As for the accidentes of thee sayd bread, it is not requisite, ne nedefull that they shuld be together chaunged

wyth

wythe theyr substaunce, because
christe in thys hys sayinge, this
is my body vseth the artycle de-
monstratyue thys, not in ỹ mas-
culine, but in the newtre gendre,
whyche implyeth but the alone
matter of the bread, and not acci
dentes of thee same therwyth, as
the masculine doeth, Whereby
christ doeth vs tunderstand that
the bread nature is only altered
& not his accidẽtes ī lyke maner
To this obiection, soche is myne
answere. Christ in thys hys say-
inge, this is my body doeth insti
tute the sacrament of hys bodye
and bloud, therfore he speaketh
vpon the same, sacramentally ti
is to wyt, he termeth the signe by
thee name of thee matter therby
sygnyfyed. He nameth the conse-
crate bread hys bodye, for ỹ it is
resem

resembled and presented therby
baptyse, is named the founteyn
of our agayn byrth, & ꝑ renun-
ge of the holy ghost, yet is it ne-
ther our newe byrth, nether thee
renuyng of ꝑ holi ghost, ne chaū
ged into thē, but so called for ꝑ
therby the sayd byrth & renuing
Gene, 15 be not only represented but also
wraughte presented and contri-
buted vnto vs, Circūcisiō was
not in very dede the couenaunt
made vnto Abraham, ne altered
into it, howbeit, it was so turned
in consyderatiō, it dyd bothe re-
present, and present the same co
uenaunt to Abrahā & his poste-
ritie: Christes breathe was cal-
led ꝑ holy ghost, not that it was
the very holy ghost, or turned in
to him, but in respect of the sayd
ghost therwyth both resembled
& exhibited semblably albeit ꝑ
cōsecrate bread is named Chri-
stes body

body, yet is it not the layde body ne chaũged into the same, but so called in consyderaciõ therwyth the layd body is both sygnifyed, pzesented & exhibited. The cup is termed chzistes bloud & the newe testamẽt: Yet that his so callyng thẽ, notwithstãding, no mã wyll depose therupõ, the cup eyther to be chzistes bloud oz his testamẽt: Termed notwithstanding ỹ layd bloud & testament, foz that it is ỹ sacramẽtal mean wherwyth they be applied & conferred vnto vs, Upon semblable consyderaciõ is the bzead named chzistes bodye. Wher as it is thought accredited the bzead substãce only & not hys accidẽtes also to be tornekynded into Chzistes bodye: By reasõ he vseth in this his saying this is my body, the article thys in the newtre & not in the masculi ne gendze: Yf this were fozmally

matthe, 26
luke, 22

C.i. argued

is our bonden duety so to do. Yet it is replyed & sayed. Paule calleth the consecrate bread & wyne, this bred. this wyne. Why shuld he so terme thē? In case ỹ one were not turned into chrystes bodye the other into hys bloud? Uerely the consideration therof is to haue vs put a difference therby betwyxte the consecrate & vnconsecrate & cōmon breade & wyne, acknowledging the former bread & wyne to be sacramentes exhibitiues of chrystes body & bloud, and these (I meane the commō bread & wyne) to be nothing lesse thē lyke cōdicioned. The last argumēt that is alledged for tornekynd is thys. If chrystes bodye be in thee bred (as vndoubtedly it is) thē it is enbreaded & his bloude enwyued, whych was alway taken for a great heresy, In respect wherof transubstantiacion nedes muste

be

be graũted as ryght true and be=
leueable. To thys I answere in
soꝛte thus. Notwythstandinge
chꝛistes body be pꝛesented in thes
bꝛed(as questionles it is) not pla
cely as ther placed spaced, & mesu
red, but ghostly: as ther vnplaced
vnspaced & not measured: Howe
beit, it is not enbꝛeaded nomoꝛe
then the deytie is recompted, en=
fleshed foꝛ that it is substancially
in vs, Nomoꝛe then the sayd god
hede is demed ébꝛeaded, foꝛ ỹt it is
entierly in eche bꝛed. No moꝛe thẽ
the holy ghoste is accompted en=
bꝛeathed, foꝛ that he was pꝛesen=
ted in chꝛistes bꝛeathe: Nomoꝛe
then the sayd holy ghost is adiud
ged enbodied oꝛ enharted, foꝛ ỹ
he is wholly in vs & in oure har=
tes. Chꝛistes body is adiudged of
no man to be accidẽted notwyth=
standing it is pꝛesented in the ac
cidentes of the bꝛead. Why then

shuld it be adiuged ẽbreaded for hys presẽce in ẏ breade. The one is as reasonable as gatherable, as thother is. Some are fule deceyued in the meanynge of these wordes thimpanacion of Christes bodye, whyche is not in simple any presẽce indeferẽtly of the sayd body in ẏ bred: Nomore thẽ ẏ incarnatiõ or enfleshing of christes godhead is indifferẽtly any presence therof in mãs fleshe ⁊ nature: But only soch a presence of christes body in the bread wherwyth they both shuld be vnseuerably personed ⁊ haue al theyr cõdicions ⁊ properties cõmõ ⁊ mutuall betwixt thẽ. Soch a presence is the personal presence of christes Godheade in hys manhode. Soch is ẏ presence of ẏ soule in ẏ body. In respect wherof as christes body is not enpersoned ĩ vs, notwithstãding it be enbodied to vs: Semblable though the sayd

body be presented in ẏ bred, howbeit, it is not become one person therw̄ whych is properly termed ẏimpaning or enbreding therof: If ẏ bred & wyne be not exchaunged in ẏ cōmuniō, Some wil demaūd of me, why ẏ aūciēt doctors make so oft report vpō thalteracion of ẏ breade & wyne. To whō this myne answere. The cōsideration why ẏ forefathers so oft report an exchaūge to be wrought in the sacramēt of christes body & bloud is: For ẏ they beleued the chosen bread & wyne to be turned frō a prophane to a godly vse, to become nomore cōmō, but special bread & wyne, & to be made nowe exhibityues sacramētes of christes body & bloud, where as before theyr hallowing they were nothyng so. And not ẏ they beleued the sayd bread & wyne to be torne kided into ẏ lordes body & bloud Thys is the exchaunge wherof ẏ

doctours make repoꝛt, and none other doo they acknowledge here beſyde, Thus I haue argueo effectually both conſecration & trã ſubſtantiacion conſtrued, after ỹ catholique doctryne to be directly repugnaũt: agaynſt gods wꝛyttẽ truth. Now wyll I trye whether the maſſe ſacrifyce in ſemblable ſoꝛt empugneth the ſaid truth And foꝛ ſo moch as this maſſe ſacrifyce is takẽ here both foꝛ a ſatiſfactiõ of ſyn & thankeſgeuinge I wyl diſcuſſe fyꝛſt whether it be a clenſing & ſatiſfactoꝛy ſacrifice. This done thẽ whether it be an acceptable & ſeruiceable thankeſgeuing to god oꝛ no. Concernyng ỹ clenſynge ſacrifyce falſely geuen to ỹ maſſe, Paule wꝛyteth in ſoꝛt as followeth: With one offering hath chꝛiſt made pfyghte foꝛ euer thẽ that are ſanctifyed. There is not one woꝛd in this paules ſaying diligently & depely conſyde-

Hebꝛe. 10.

red ȳ enforceth not moch against the before specified sacrifice. In respect wherof I wyll report orderly, & wayghe eche word of the sayd saying seuerally by it selfe. Paul sayth not wyth a manyfold or renewed but with one offering hath christ made perfecte for euer the sanctefied, In consyderacion whereof they bee foule deceaued, who auouche Christes sacrifyce ought to be reuiued & multiplied to the ful pardō & contentaciō of our synne, otherwyse vnpardonable. And therfore repete the sayd sacrifyce day by day to the same effect. For why that, that is oft offered cannot iustly be recōpted to be offered but ones: By reason a repeted & renewed sacrifice is not merely syngle & one, but manifold & diuerse. If christ had oft died notwithstāding he were the selue same Christ, that doeth so oft dye Howbeit ȳ his often dyeng shuld

not be adiuged one single but son
dry deaths. Though it be ỹ self sa
me body ỹ dieth by ỹ second deth,
which died through ỹ former deth
Yet is ỹ twyse dyeng of ỹ body re
cõpted not one but two dethes (as
28, wytnesseth Johã in hys Apo.) E-
uen so: yf christ were oft sacrificed
though he were the same & none
other christ that is so offered. Yet
were that oft sacrificying of hym
no syngle one, but a many folde &
multiplied sacrifyce. In consider-
acion wherof, sythe by the one of
feringe of christe, oure synnes be
throughly pourged (as paule re-
cordeth): Sythe an often offer is
not an ones, but a manifold sacri
fyce, though it be of ỹ selue same
matter: Christes bodi nether may
ne ought to be agayne sacrificed
either bloudely or vnbloudely to
ỹ doynge away of our defaultes
Now to ỹ entretable text of paul
By one offering hath christe, &c.

By ẏ ones offerig of christ. Paul meaneth his paynful & bloude sacrifice, ones done vpon the crosse for euer, else could not ẏ his sacrifice pourge our synnes. For noo sacrifice wout bloudshed clēseth syn. According to this sayinge of paul wout bloudsheding ther is no remissiō of syn to be atteigned By reason wherof right oppen it is, they greuously erre, who hold opiniō ẏ our faultes ar pardoned through theyr vnsufferable & vn bloudy sacrificig of christes bodi otherwyse vnpdonable. With one offrig hath christ made perfyte &c. Note this paul sayth note in ẏ p̄sent tence doth make perfect, as though christ now doth pdon our syns vnpdoned before, but in the preterperfyt tēce hath made pfyt: Purposely to do vs herby to wyt ẏ we ar already redemed & clēsed by ẏ ones offering of christ neuer to be reuyued eyther sufferablye

Hebre 9.

or vnsufferably bloudely or vn-
bloudely to purge our synnes w
al. In consyderacion wherof our
Hebre. 10. catholiques be in a foule greuou
se errour, for theyr auouchyng (en
forced questionles so too saye not
so moche of a good ground as of
a good entent) our synnes clerely
to be clensed wyth theyr vnsuffe-
rable, & vnbloudye sacrysyce of
chryst. For where remission of syn
is, ther is (sayth Paul) nomore a
sacrysyce for the same. By one of-
fering hath chryst made perfyght
for euer the sanctified. Note this
paule sayth not, Chryst hath ma-
de perfyght for a tyme, but for e-
uer the sanctefyed. Certes yf chry
ste were to be agayne sacrysyced
to the ful contentacion & clensing
of synne, thē dyd he not thrughe
hys once offerynge perfyte for
euer, but for a tyme the sanctefy-
. For why the sacrysyce that is

remedyles to be reuiued to the cõ
tentatiõ & satisfaction of syn con
tẽteth god for the same, not for e=
uer, but for a tyme. By reason
wherof oure catholikes are to be
blamed, who rather ernestly then
godly wil & contend that christes
body shuld be agayne sacrifyced
to the satisfaction & purgynge of
syn, otherwyse after theyr iudge=
mẽt vnpardonable. An errour
no lesse deragotorye to the entier
tee & fulnes of christes ones sacri
fice then preiudiciall to the mayn
teyners therof. For why to renew
the sayde sacrifyce is vtterlye to
vnperfyt, & disable it quite, fully
to clense and do away syn. For so
paul argueth to the Hebrues, the
sacrifyces of the old lawe dydnot
remyt syn, for that they were day
lye repeted, else not to be renewed
If thys be formallye argued of
paul (as out of question it is) the
it

it argueth that chryst is not to be agayn offered lesse hys fyrst offering being entier & sufficiente to purge syn be through the repetig & reuiuinge therof vnperfyted & dishabled to the ful contētatiō of syn. (An issue vtterly wyth al possible endeuour too bee exchued.) Wyth one sacrifyce hath Chryst made perfit for euer thē ỹ ar holi made. In ỹ paul auoucheth her chryst through his one sacrifice to haue made perfyt for euer themỹ ar sanctified, He doeth vs herby tunderstād, ỹ the saintes ar none otherwyse redemed & saued then through ỹ one offering of ỹ sayd chryst vpō the crosse, & so cōsequētly no man cā be otherwyse saued. For they be saītes ỹ be saued: In respect wherof it is nothig auswerable to, ỹ truth ỹ ỹ catholiqnes not so godly as stysly maynteyn, it is to wyt we be redemed throughe the

ghe the

the agayn sacrificing of christ o=
therwise vnperdonable. For yf ẏ
masse sacrifice be a contētacion ⁊
satisfactiō for syn, thē is ẏ once sa
crifice of christ vtterlyto be aban
doned ⁊ disauthorized. For why Hebr. viii
to institute a new sacrifice of chri
ste is tabrogate and adnul thold.
Yea yf christ must be agayn offe=
red to the contētation of syn, then
muste he be also wofully payned
and done to death again. For (as
the sayd paul sayth ther is no con Hebre. 9.
tēting sacrifice without it beblou
dy. In consideratiō wherof, he ar
gueth yf christ shuld be oftē offe=
red, nedes must he oft suffer ofte
dye: Wherfore (most gētle reder)
sythe of the aforesayd it appereth
ful opē, ẏ the masse mercy workīg
offredge dyrectly gaynsayeth not
only. ii. or. iii, but sondry scriptu=
res, ⁊ thē not doubtful but playn
and

and not only scryptures(whyche symplie to cõtrary is a sinne ful greuouse): but endeuourethe it self also to mourdze chzist,whych is moze greuouse):and not onlye ȳ,but vtterly to adnul & abolisshe chzistes most pzecious & entier sacrifice,done vpon the crosse (whyche foz too doo as it is a defaulte most greuouse,so most vnsufferable): I beseche the hartely iudge and esteme the sayd one sacrifice accozdingly,that is to wyt to be the alone sacrifice wherwith our syns be clensed and done awaye: And thynke and depose vpon the pzyuate masse sacrysyce as thou oughtest to do, namely to be nothyng lesse then a clensyng sacrysyce. But here wyll oure catholiques say they doo nothynge lesse then vpholde the masse offeringe to do awaye synne, Foz that they

ackno w=

acknowledge wyth vs (the profe=
stauntes) belongethe to Christes
passiō alone. God be praysed ther
fore in oure redubted souereigne
lorde the Kynges maiestie, Who
by a worthy acte of parlyamente,
hath enforced thē to the outward
acknowledge thereof, otherwyse
opēly maynteyning the contrary
But in case the foresayd persons,
meaned that inwardly in ẏ hart,
whych wyth the tongue they out=
wardlye graunt & professe: They
wold not defend eche parcell of ẏ
Masse canon to be godly & bele=
ueable as they do. For why there
it is playnly sayd, the masse sacri=
fice enforceth effectually to the re
demption & ramsoning of the sou
les. The very wordes of the sayd
Canon be these. Remembre lorde
thy seruātes &c: for the whych we
offre vnto the, or the which do of=
fre vnto the this sacrifice of pray

for the selues, & to thee ransom of
theyr soules. Loe, here it is open,
ỹ priest sacrificing of christe (which
is here termed a prayse sacrifice)
is purposely purposed & wrought
to redeme & ransom soules withal
Which thing doth apperteigne a-
lonelye to christes sufferable and
bloudy sacrifice. Wel notwithstā
ding, this thalleged saying out of
the canon were not playn & suffi-
cient enough to proue the sayd ca
non testablishe the masse sacrifice
to contēt god: Howbeit ther is an
other ỹ questiōles argueth the sa-
me, whych the priest alway repor-
teth & prayeth in the poost cōmon
Then glysshe wherof is thys. O
holy Trinite perfourme that thys
sacrifyce whych I vnworthy ha-
ue offered vnto theyes of thi maie
stie may be acceptable to the & be
also through thy mercy propicia-
tory, that is to say mercy working

both to me ⁊ al thē for whō I haue
sacrificed it. Loe hear in manifest
wordes ẏ prest sollicieth god pur
posely to obteyn of him, this his sa
crifice to be ꝓpiciatory ⁊ to appea
se his wrath. In rōsideratiō wher
of grantable it is ẏ the pryue mas
sers acknowlege i very dede theyr
masse sacrifice to be mercy workig
whyles they contēd the canon ther
of to be throughely true ⁊ godlye,
notwithstanding theyr mouth say
inge to the cōtrary. What an vn-
sufferable mockedge is this aswel
of god as of our soueraygne lord
ẏ kig, to acknowlege w̄ thē ẏ mas
se sacrifice to be nothing propicia
tory, ⁊ yet in the canon (otherwyse
named ẏ masse secret) to graūt it
offered to redeme vs wythall, ⁊ to
praye it myghte be propiciatorye,
If we hartely thoughte w̄ god ⁊
our prince ẏ Masse sacrifice were

not propiciatorye: We wold not
throughlye mayntene the Masse
Canon, We wold not saye there
wyth we offer Christes bodye to
oure redemption, We wolde not
instant God as we do, to enforce
our sacrifycing of christe to pur-
chase hys mercy. But here it is
replyed the forsayde Canon is
misconstrued. For it meaneth no
thyng lesse thē that the masse sa-
crifice is satisfactory in very de-
de, but in name alone. So ter-
med in consideratiō it is a resem
blaūce or memory of christes pro
piciatorie sacrifice executed and
perfyted vpō the crosse ones for
euer. To thys replial thus I an-
swere, In case the sayd sacrifyce
were not to be takē, to be satisfac
tory, Why is it in ȳheretofore mē
cioned Canon auouched, We of
fre the sayd sacrifice to the redēp
tiō both of our soules & others?

Why

Why pray we that the sacrifice
might be made satisfactory: If
we wold not it shuld be taken for
satisfactory: Yf it were not to be
taken for a satisfactory sacrifice,
and that after the true meaning
of the, who fathered the Canon:
They wold neuer haue so writte
vpō it, as they haue done. Again
yf we thought not hartely that it
were soch a sacrifice: We wolde
not affyrme, we sacrifice it to re
deme vs and others withal. We
wolde not ne durste sollicite god
to enforce it propiciatorye: dre-
dyng ꝑ dredeful saying of christ
thou shalt be iustified by thi wor
des, & by thy wordes ꝑ shalte be
cōdēpned. Let vs hedely beware
lest christ iudge vs by our mouth
as he dyd ꝑ wycked seruaūt. For
the mouthe vtterāce as of godly
matters maketh to saluation, as
wytnesseth Paule: So of vngod

mathe, 12

mathe. 25
Rome, 10

to dampnation. Let vs therfore condẽpne, as of bonde duetye we tyght) the therfore saying of thee masse canó, Which, as they plain ly, & directly withstãd gods wyll ten worde, so the kinges statutes: lest we through our allowaunce & prayinge of the same incurre & deserue ẽiust wrath both of god & of our prince. Here I cannot but dis close the vnsufferable subtilitie of our catheloques in this purposed matter. Therfore good reder, earnestly respecte the same to thy aduoydance of theyr trayn. They hauing in consyderatiõ that now lefullye they cannot: in respecte of thẽ euidẽce of gods wyttẽ worde agaynst thẽ, which to gaynsay were not sufferable: Ne dare any longer vphold theyr masse sacrifice to be mercy worthyng. For that it emplieth notable repugnaunce to an acte of parliamente whyche

not

not to obey and approue, as it is vnsyttinge, so ryght punishable: Consydering also yf theyr Masse canon were to be vnderstād after hys gramer sence (as doubtles it is) it must remedeles be condempned & canceled oute of the masse boke, as heresye to god, and disobeysaunce to the King: Wherupō happely myght consequencly ensue the vtter decaye and confusiō of the masse selue, (an issue no lesse perfourmable thē resonable & ensuable): Haue at ẏ last qualefyed and blāched the sayd canon in the heretofore alledged places therof after thys sorte. To offer the sacrifice of prayse for the redēption of our soules meaneth nothing else, but toffre the sayd sacryfyce for a remembraunce of Christes sacryfyce, ones wroughte vpon thee crosse to redeme oure soules wyth

am. To praye that the masse sacri
fyce myghte bee propiciatorye is
to praye, it myght be a memorye
of the propiciatorie sacrifyce. Je
sus what a far fetched meanyng
of the foresayd is thys. Wherche
cannot wel be ymagyned moche
lesse gathered of ỹ same. Yt they
who fathered the Canon, mea=
ned the masse sacrifyce were not
offered purposelye to redeme vs
wythal, but to record the satisfac
torye sacrifice: Theyr wordes vn=
doubtly wold rather haue enfor=
ced for ỹ prest sacrifice to be a me=
morye of the satisfactorye sacrifice
thẽ to be it it self. Therfor ỹ sayd
fathers so did wryte the sayd Ca
nõ as thei might easely be vnder
stãded what thei vnderstode ther
by, And so wrote it so openlye as
they possible could deuise: By re
son wherof sythe ỹ before mẽcyo=
ned sayinges of the canon make
al togethers for the priest sacry=

fyce to be pꝛopiciatoꝛy Queſtion
les theyꝛ meaning is that ỹ ſayd
ſacrifice appeaſeth goddes yze &
indignatiõ & cleanſeth ſyn. Howe
ſoeuer ours catholiques now ta
ke thẽ. Though ſaye our catho=
liques)the betoze eſpecyfyed al=
legations ſeme targue the maſſe
ſacrifice to be ſatiſfactoꝛy yet ar
they to be conſtrued as wee take
them, And neuer were they other
wyſe takẽ eyther of vs, eyther el=
ſe of others learned & catholique
mẽ. Lo the ſhameleſſe vanitie of
our catholiques, they do not on=
ly lye in myſtakinge the Canon,
but in miſrepoꝛting the myndes
of ſondꝛye wꝛyters. So that the
cõmon pꝛouerbe is verifyed one
leaſyng doeth accompanye ano=
ther. Is not Mayſter doctour
ſmyth of Oxẽtoꝛd a great clerke
and moch traded in auncięt wꝛy
ters (as it appereth by hys doy=
inges): Yet he in the hundereth

and one, and twētye leaffe of hys
boke entituled the defence of the
sayed sacrifyce of the masse wry-
teth, for ẏ sayd satrifice to be pro
piciatory in sort thus. Doeth not
this place proue the masse to be a
sacrifice propiciatorye, Syth by
the offeringe of christes body in
sacrifice at it gods wrath towar-
des this mā, & his seruauntes cō
ceyued for theyr synnes (whecby
the deuyl had soch power on thē)
was pacyfied & appeased? Agayn
in the next leaffe ensuing thus he
wrytethe. Nothyngt can be more
euidētly spoken for the sacrifyce
of ẏ holye masse ẏ it is a sacrifyce
propiciatory curing mans woun
des (that is to say, hys synnes) &
that also by the ordināce of christ
commaunding it to be done for a
remēbraunce of hys death and ry
synge ag[illegible] to mayster
Smyth

Smyth: Wherby it is ryght eui
dent that he thought the masse sa
cryfyce to be propriatory, and I
doubte not vnderstode the tofore
named canon as I do. Cocleus a
man hyghely esteined amongeste
oure catholiques partly for hys
ryght iudgemēt in scripture mat
ters (as they suppose) partlye for
hys learnyng, wryteth in hys for
mer replyall to Bullyuger in the
syxt chapter therof for the pryeste
sacryfyce to bee propiciatorye in
sorte as foloweth: We after ye ac-
costumed maner of speaking in ye
Church name not the supper but
the masse, a sacryfice not onlye of
prayse and thankesgeuynge, but
of mercy workyng also, wherwyth
we endeuoure oure seiues to pray
se god instaunte hym and appease
hym. For wee offere the Masse
sacrifi

masse sacrypfyce not for the alone pourgyng of synne,) which thou falsely doest charge vs wythall, but for sondrye other skylles also and nedes. As it is euydently knowen of the holy Canon. Cocleus woordes in Latyne be these Nos autem inxtu consuetum in Ecclesia loquendi modum non cænã sed missam dicimus sacrificium non solum laudis & gratiarum actionis, sed etiam propiciationis. Quo deum laudare inuocare & placare satagim⁹. Non enim pro sola peccatorum expiatione (quod tu falso imputas nobis) sed pro aliis causis & necessitatibus permultis Missæ sacrificiũ offerimus, Quemadmodum ex sacro Canone liquido cognoscitur & ex multiplici diuersarum collectarum titulo verborũ q; contextu conspicitur. Here it is ryghte manyfeste and playn that Cocle bothe wel learned & godly iudgemẽted after ỹ oppynyon

opinio of our catholiques doeth not only say that ỹ masse sacrifice is satisfactorye, but appealeth to the Canon therin as answereable ther vnto after hys iudgemẽt. Freer Holmaster (who was so worthely estemed of the catholiques as they alotted hym to be one of the reasoners agaynst the protestantes in ỹ emperours last dyet kept at Ratyspone) wryteth in hys boke entyteled the exposytyon of the massepraiers & ceremonies in the behalfe of the masse satisfactory sacrifice in maner folowyng. Now that our sacrifyce is named a prayse sacrifyce I suppose it offendeth no man. For oure aduersaries acknowledge also the masse, for ỹ prayers laudes & thãkesgeuig therin accostumed to be made, maye be called a sacrifice of thãkesgeuing & prayse, But that we auouche it to be

also a propi

a propiciatorye sacrifice thys doo
they stedfastly deny & disaffyrme.
Hokmaysters wordes in Latyn be
these. Iam q̃ sacrificiū nostrū appel-
letur sacrificium laudis nominem o-
pinor offendit. Nam et aduersarii fa-
centur missam ꝓpter preces, laudes &
gratiarum actiones inibi fieri solitas
sacrificium dici posse eucharisticium
hoc est gratiarum actionis et laudis.
At quod nos asserimus preter cetera
etiã esse propiciatorium sacrificium
hoc constanter negant. Lo, here hok
maysier not only in hys own, but
in the person also of thee catholi-
ques (otherwyse termed papistes)
as tul according wyth hym herin
auoucheth contrary to out catho
liques the masse bothe to be a thã
kesgeuing and contentation and
pardon for our synne. This wrote
the sayd Hokmaysterin his before
named Boke for the defence and
allowance of thys sayinge of thee
canon

Pro quibus tibi offerimus, etc. for ẏ
whych we offer vnto the, or ẏ whi
the do offre to the this sacrifice of
prayse for thē selues and al theyrs
for the ramson of theyr soules etc.
Wherby we lerne it is not ẏ fayth
only of Hofmaister, but of ẏ foren
catholiques also, ẏ the masse sacri
fice is mercyworkinge ⁊ that thee
wordes also of thee masse canon, ẏ
importe ẏ same, ought so insimple
to be takē without any far fetched
glosse. Whatsoeuer our Englishe
catholiques for a tyme do hold to
ẏ cōtrary. Wel syth it is both ac-
knoleged of our catholikes ⁊ grō
dely I trust argued ẏ ẏ masse of-
fredge is not satisfactory or ful cō
tētīg. The next entretable matter
is ẏ ẏ sayd sacrifice is nothīg auai
lable ether for ẏ quick or the dead
Our catholiques cōtēd it is ꝓfy-
table for thē both, but how moche
orī what mesure it lyeth not in the
powre of man to lymit: But thys

theyr opynyon can not stande w
Chrystes satysfatorie sacrifyce.
By reason it is a full cōtentacyō
and satisfactyon for synne, & so ẏ
Masse sacrifyce awaleth nothīg
at al to the clensyng thereof. For
yf it auailed any thynge thereto:
Thē wete it propyciatorie aparte
thoughe not entierly: Thē were
christes sacrifice satisfactore but
aparte & not wholy: Thē were ẏ
Masse sacrifice nolesse satysfac-
tore then Christes, For ẏ it shuld
make partely for ẏ satysfactiō of
synne as christes doth: Whyche
is a blasphemy to thynke moche
more to speake: Then were oure
catholiques deceyued in disaffyr
mynge the masse sacrifyce to bee
propiciatorye. But what nede I
to argue thee sayed sacrifyce to
be vnfruteful, The catholiques
them selues in conclusyon graut
the

the same, whyle they auouche the full & entier fruyte & vertu of the prest masse to consyst in the appli-all of christes merytes vnto vs, o-therwyse vtterly diuoided of ẏ sa-me ones merited vpō the crosse in general for almē. Which is ẏ sacra mēt & not the sacrifice, For in thee sacrifice ther is nothinge applyed and rendred vnto vs, but to God alone, otherwyse no sacrifyce at al It is the sacramēt alone, & not the sacrifice that geueth to vs, accor-dinge to the ryghte definitions of thē both: In consyderatiō wherof sythe the masse fruyte consysteth, not in the prest sacrifice, but in the applyall & gyft of christes body & bloud, not as sacrifice of the prest (whych is but a coūtrefeiture & re semblaunce of thee true sacrifice) but as offered of christe hym selfe vpon the crosse ones for euer: It muste nedes argue that the masse

frute cõsisteth in the sacramet alone & not in ỹ sacrifice also. For why ỹ applyall & deliuere of thee frutes of chrystes death & agayn rysing to vs, is gods gyfte vnto vs & not ours vnto him. So ỹ it is the sacramẽt & not the sacrifice of ỹ masse ỹ is auaileable. For a sacramẽt is defined to be an holy token, wherby god geueth vs, fre pardon of syns. A sacrifice cõtrary wise is defyned to be that wher by we rẽder somewhat vnto god. In respecte wherof oure catholiques be moch blame worthi, who yelde to the masse sacrifyce whyche is appertenynge only to the Lordes supper, I meane the applyall & render of the benefyghtes of chrystis deth & resurrectiõ. Whych dyde as it is a groũded prouffe of falshode so of ỹ vnauaileablenes of ỹ masse, as otherwise vnfrutful. Though (wilsom say) the masse sacrifice applyeth not,

ne rendzeth to vs chzistes merytes; Howbeit wythoute that they cannot possibly be pzesented and deliuered vnto vs. And so ỹ sayd sacrifice must no remedy be auayleable. That is not so. Foz ỹ sayd merites begyuen vs both in baptisme & absolutiõ, yea & in the cõmunion to wythout the pzest sacrypyce as shal here after be declared, And so the sayde sacrypice in thys respert is fruytles. Yet doo our catholiques replye, the foze-sayd sacrypyce saye they, though it maketh nothing to the applial of chzistes merites to vs warde: Howbeit in that it is a thãkesgeuing it must nedes be auaileable In this replial fyzst this is denyable, ỹ the pzest sacrifying of chzistes body & bloud is a thãkesgeuing. Foz ỹ merely & nakedly respected as nothig but an offredg nothig is thãked thereby, & so no

In dede the prayers incident ther
to be a thankesgeuinge. But beit
the sayd sacrifice were a thankes=
geuinge. Yet it shall not orderlye
here vpon ensue that it were an ac
ceptable & auaileable thãkesgeui=
ge For ther be two sortes therof, ỹ
one good & profytable, thee other
nought & vnfrutefull: And yf the
prest sacrylyce be a thãkesgeuing
it must nedes be both vngodlye &
vnfrutefull, & so of the badsort of
thanke render, By reason it is in=
stitute besydé gods wyttè word=
des & so contrarie to the same, in
that it is a putting therto. For yf
it were fonded vpõ the sayd word
it shuld by al lykelyhod be gron=
ded vpon christes wordes concer=
ninge his supper. But ỹ it is not
And so it is a forged worshipe thã
kerendre, For christ at his supper
neyther offered hym self ne inioy=
ned

ned others to sacrifice him to his father. Orderly examine eche word of the institution of hys supper & ye shal wel apperceaue thys to be ful certayn. Christ at ỹ sayd supper tuke bred, But that is not to sacrifyce hym selue. Els he sacrifyced hym selue to hys father so oft, as he dyd eate. He gaue thãkes, but that is not to offere hym selue, Els he sacrifyed hym selue to hys father, what tyme he encresed fyue barelye loaues & fed ther wyth fyue thousand men: He broke it and gaue it to his disciples. But that is not to rẽdre it to god, whych is behoueful in eche sacrifyce. His disciples toke & eate the bread & his body, so do ỹ lea'mẽ, in lykemãner, Yet they offre thẽ not The which is geuẽ for you, herby he meaneth not to be here sacrifyed, Els shulde he offer hym selue oft, and not ones, Els wolde not

matthe. 26
Luke. 22

our prestes ouerhipped those wor
des in their cõsecratiõ. The dis-
ciples were entoned to do this in
his remẽbrauũce and so they dyd:
What then? So doo all Chri-
stianes & the kaythful lealtye per
forme ỹ same: Yet offer they hym
not. As ther is not one word tou-
ching this former part of ỹ lords
supper, ỹ enforceth for the priestes
sacrifice: Euen so is ther none in
thys latter ỹ maketh for ỹ same.
For ỹ I haue spokẽ of ỹ same, is
reducible & appliaũt to the latter
portiõ of the sayde supper. Thus
it appereth playn christ nether of
fered him selue in hys supper ne
cõmaunded others to offer hym
in the same to hys father. In re-
spect wherof paul spoke the selue
same wordes vnto the vnpriested
1. Cor. xi. Corinthians whych Christ repor
ted to hys disciples. And bad the
also perfourme all those thinges
which

whyche Christ demaunded to be perfourmed of his disciples, whi che thing he wold neuer haue done, yf ẏ vnprested Corin. mought not accoplished & put in executiõ al matters concerning the lordes supper. Thus it is playn the masse sacrifice is not groũded vpon Goddes wryttẽ word, & so nether acceptable or seruiceable to God ne fruteful to mã. For why, whoso worshippeth god wythout his special word for ẏ same worshippeth him wythout fayth. By reason true fayth issueth onlye from gods wryttẽ word as wytnesseth s. Paul. Fayth cometh by hearig & ẏ hearinge by gods word. And who so worshippeth god without fayth, synneth. For as Paul saith whatsoeuer thing is not of fayth, is syn. So that here by it is full opẽ the sayd sacrifice is synful & consequently not to be frequẽted or vsed. Our cathosiques in that

Roma.10

Roma.14

that they acknowlege theyr priest sacrifice not to be mercyworkyng suppose it so takē, may wel stande both with goddes word & christes honour. But in so demeng they be foule deceyued. For why to attēpt to offer christ as it is an enterpryse toto bolde and presumptuouse: so vnsufferable & blasphemouse. For thys is the state & condiciō of leyfull sacrifyces before god, that they sacryfyced be not merelye of thē selues, but in respect of theofferers godlynes regarded and hys synfulnes dyslyked of God. The sacryfyces of Abel and Cain, not
Gene. iiii. wythstādyng they were not moch what vnlyke in thē selues: howbe it they were dyuersly respected of god in consyderatiō of the soūdrynes betwixt ẏ offerers. For thone god regarded for Abels sake, the other he hated and abhorred for Cain sake. The lorde loked vnto

Abel

Abel(sayth moyses)and to hys of
fering. But to Cain and hys offe
ringe he loked not. Marke thys,
fyrste he loked vpon Abell ere he
respected hys offeringe. fyrste he
dyslyked Cain or he dislyked hys
sacrifyce, Whereby we do vnder=
stand that the offering is lyked or
dislyked of god in respect of ỹ offe
rer. So ỹ here vpon it grondelye
arguethe that the offerer is bothe
worthyer & better estemed of God
then hys offering. For that, that
god regardeth merely for it selue
is better & more estemed of hym,
thã that whiche he regardeth but
in respect of another. In consyde=
ration wherof yf christ were to be
sacrificed of thee priest, then were
the priest bothe worthyer & better
accepted before god thẽ christ him
selue, as it is gatherable of the be
fore sayde. By reason wherof thee
priest sacrifyce as it most hyghly
empay

empayzethe chzistes honoure & mateſtie ſo vncomperablely offendeth god the father & ſo moſte exchueable: Wolde you further know why ỹ pzeſt ſacrifice is vnſitting & diſalowable? Thẽ diligentlye note the ſequeles, & after ſayinges, Who ſo be autoziſed & appoynted to ſacrifice Chzist body muſt be pzeſtes after the ozder ether of Aaron oz Melchiſedech, But our offerers ought not to be pzeſted after Aarons ozder. Foz that his pzeſthode is quyte repealed & done away. Syth the pzieſthode ſayth Paul is tranſlated of neceſſite muſt the law be tranſlated alſo, Thẽ remedies muſt the fozeſayde ſacrifycers be pzieſted after Melchiſedech ozder, els are thei vnpzeſted. But thei cãnot be pzeſtes as melchiſedech was: Bycauſe who ſo is a pzeſte after hys ozder is an euerlaſtynge pzieſte accozdig to this ſaying of dauid

Hebze, 7

Pſal: 14,

Thou art an euerlasting prest ac
ter ỹ order of Melchisedech, but
we be al immortal & but for a ty=
me, therfore not eternall & conse=
quẽtly none euerlastinge prestes,
Wher vpõ it formally argueth ỹ
our vsurped prestes vsurpe & ta=
ke the authorite to sacrifice Chri
stes body, whych is graũted ney=
ther to thẽ ne to anye mã els. By
reason wherof they be blame wor
thy for ỹ theyr vsurpatiõ of soch
autorytee. Let no mã sayth Paul
take honoure to him selue but he
ỹ is called of god as was Aaron
To prcede further in ỹ disproufe
of the prest sacrifice, Howe can it
possible be ỹ our prestes could sa
crifi chzistes bodi & bloud: With
out theyr due sacramẽtes ỹ sayde
body & bloud nether cã bepsented
ne sacrifyced, as the prestes them
selues acknoledge as most certẽ:
For ỹ sacrified bred & wine nether
be ne cã be sacramẽtes of chzistes

Hebre:5

body & bloud? By reason they be otherwyse vsed thē christ selue ordeyned thee sacramētes of ỹ same to be. Can the baptisme water be iustly recōpted a sacramēt wher it is transposed to other vsages thē it is prepared for of christ by hys word & ỹ ryght ordinaūce of ỹ same, namely to be gatsed vpon, too sprynkle & washe mē w al, to christē belles to washe our clothes w all? No truely. Can the circumcision or of pare which the Jewes and turkes now vse, be rightly demed a sacramente? No verely. Certes nomore can the sacrificed bread & wyne be iustly accompted sacramētes of ỹ lordes body & bloud. But heere oure Catholiques replye saynge the wordes of consecratiō be reported vpō the bread & wyne ere they be sacrypyced, In consyderation wherof, nedes must they be sacramētes. Thys ther replialis nothinge formall ne forceable & ỹ

by theyr own doctryne. Be it that alaymā repozted the consecration wozdes on the bzead & wyne oz the pzest vttered thē not purposing ȳ making of chzistes body & bloud. The sayd bzead & wyne were after our pzestes doctrine nothing lesse thē geuing sacramētes of ȳ aboue named body & bloud, notwithstanding the repozt of the consecratiō wozdes ouer thē. So that it standeth wythe catholique doctryne ȳ in symple the bare repozt & naked vttrance of the consecration wozdes enfozce not the sacramēt. So that the fozesayd replial is nothig effectual, being neyther true ne catholique: Now to ȳ befozē mencioned sacrificed bzed agayn, I put ȳ case, ther were such a deuout pziest who were so deuoutly disposed as he wolde eate none other bzeade & dzinke none other dzinke at meales but sacramentally consecrate

bzead

bred & wyne & wold in considera-
ciō hereof for eche his dyner and
supper purposely report daye by
day at hys masse, the cōsecration
wordes ouer hys bread & wyne ye
he wold vse at ye sayde meales: I
suppose noman be he neuer so ca-
tholiq̄ & oldfashioned wyldepose
ye sayd bred & wyne to be geuīg sa
cramētes of christes body & blou
de notwithstāding the report of ye
cōsecratiō wordes ouer thē, And
verely the consecration hereof is
the dyrecte & oppē abuse agaynst
the ryght institutiō & vsage of ye
sacramentes of thee sayde bodye
and bloud: Nomore be the sacry
fyced bred & wyne sacramētes of
christes body & bloud, notwithstā
dyng ye rehersal of the consecratiō
wordes ouer thē: For why christe
instituted at his supper his body
not to be sacrificed but etē. In re
specte wherof he saythe not take
sacry

sacrifice, this is my body: but take eate, thys eate my body. Ther be thre matters ryght nedefull & be houeful to the natural beynge of a sacramẽt, The due element the due word ỹ especial commaunde mẽt of god directed therto. Wher any of the afore sayd want, there can be no sacrament. By reason wherof the sacrificed bread & wyne cã be no sacramẽtes, notwithstãding they be the due elemẽtes consecrate wyth due wordes. In consyderation ther wãteth gods special commaũdemẽt so to auto ryse vs & able vs to sacrifice thẽ as to take thẽ & eate thẽ. So that they be but pure elemẽtes & no sacramẽtes. Therfore christes body & bloud cãnot possibly be sacrifyced in & by thẽ. Whereby it appereth euidẽt, ỹ prest sacrificing is of nothing lesse thẽ of christes body & bloud. Thus (good reder) I

haue argu

argued (I suppose forceably) the
priest sacrifice to be nether propi
ciatorie ne auaileable, nether god
ly ne approueable but sinfull and
vnsufferable. Therfore I beseech
ȳ vtterly renoūce it & detest it en
bracing & vsing in the stede ther
of the most holy cōmunion. But
happely thou art loothe so to do
tyl I haue sopled the reasens fet
ched out of scriptures whych co=
lourably seme to ratefy the sayd
sacrifyce, By reason whereof I
wyl addresse me to the ful answe
re & resolutiō of the same. Wher
as it is argued christ in respecte
he is pristed after Melchisedech
ordre offred him selue bodely vn
der the fourme of bread & wyne,
for ȳ Melchisedech offered bread
& wine. This reason holdeth not
because it is false that Melchise
dech sacrificed bred & wyne. For
Moses sayth not Melchisedech
offered

offered but brought forth bread and wyne. To bring forth is not to offer, He sayth not he brought forth bread & wyne for a sacrifice but wythout any mẽtion of sacrifice at al. He saith not he brought forth the sayd bread & wyne to god, but to Abrahã as it is right gatherable of ỹ Historie to whõ to do sacrifice were an ymage seruice, & therfore Melchisedech sacrificed not bread & wyne. Here it is obiected yt Moyses meaned not ỹ melchisedech offered bread and wyne: Why adioned he immediatly thereto this: he beynge the preest of the most hyghest god blessed hym: Mary not because he sacrificed the bred & wyne but for ỹ he blessed Abrahã, doynge vs hereby to wete, as Melchisedech declared hym selue to bee a kinge in employing vpon Abraham bred & wyne: So in blessing

hym to be a prest. For as the em=
ployng of bread and wyne, was
a kingly function, so the blessing
a prestly effyce. In consyderatiō
wherof the forsayd Moses thus
wryteth. And Melchisedech thee
kynge of Salem brought forth
Gene.xliii breade and wyne, and he was a
preste of the moost hyghest God
and blessed hym. The meanynge
wherof is thys, as me semeth) be
cause Melchysedech was a kyng
he played the kynge he employed
vpō Abrahā hyghe chere, bicause
he was a prest also, he played the
preste he blessed hym. In that he
was a king he chered Abraham,
in that he was a preste, he bles=
sed hym. But here some wyl saye
Abraham was alreadye greatly
enriched wyth kynglye spoyles i
hadde no nede of Melchisedechs
chere, therfore by al lykelyhod he
profered hym not the bread and
wyne,

wyne. To thys I answere, not wythstandynge Abraham neded not Melchysedech chertinge, yet he chered hym in fulle prouse of hys hospytalyte and humanytie toward both hym and his. Thus both Chrisostome and Iosephus thynke. But bett Melchysedech offered breade and wyne, and in so doynge fygured christ. Shall it folowe there vpon, that Christ offered hym selue bodelye in fourmes of breade and wyne? Noo verelye. Was not Aaron a fygure of Christe, dyd he not fygure and resemble hym selue in sacrysycynge of a gote? Yeas certaynly. Yet noo man wyll or oughte to gather, bycause Aaron who was a fygurer of christ sacrificed a gote, Therfore christ offered hi selue corporally in or vnder thee shape

shape and kynd of a gote. If the
before mencioned doying of mel
chisedech were applied to christe
after this sort folowing I could
not but acknowledge the appli-
cation therof both sufferable and
godly. As melchisedech the king
of Salem prokered bread & wine
to Abrahã, & hys sodiers, not for
the to sacrifice, but to eat to their
relief, & blessed the sayde Abrahã
& in him al his posterite: Righte
so christ our kynge, the kynge of
spiritual peace & rightuousnes,
presenteth at his supper to al vs
his communers bothe bread and
wyne (sacramẽtes exhibitiues of
hys body & bloud) not to be offe-
red but thone to beeatẽ & thother
to be dronkẽ to oure comfort, and
blesseth vs al, & in vs al oure of-
spring. The next alledged reasõ
for ỳ masse sacrifice is this dedu
ced oute. i. &. iii of ỳ pphet Mala
chye

chse, I haue no wyl to you sayth the Lord of hostes & I wyl not receaue of your hande a sacrifyce. For from the rysing of the sonne vnto the gowing down myname is great emōg the people. Lo her (say our catholiques), ỹ prophet prophesieth of the vtter refusall and repeale of the Jewysche sacrifyce & of the succession chose and acceptaūce of a new, whych is to be vnderstandē of the masse alone. This ther vnderstandinge is nothing answereable to the prophetes meaning. For why he speketh only of soch sacrifice which is offered in al places of al men and frō the morninge to nighte. The masse sacrifice is not sacrificed in eche place, but in ỹ church alone, not from the morninge to night, but from the morninge to noonetyde, not of eche man indifferently, but of the prieste alone.

The alledged reason out of thee eyght & twelue of Daniel enkoꝛceth nothing to the pꝛeſt ſacrifice Foꝛ daniel as it appereth playne in the nynthe chapter entreateth of the aboliſhmēt of the Jewyſhe dayly ſacrifice, whych is diſcontynued foꝛ certeyn yeres thꝛough the tyꝛan Antiochus. This ſacrifice was offered twyſe on the day in the moꝛnyng & at nyght. The Maſſe ſacrifice is ſacrificed but ones on the day, & that in the moꝛnyng, thother was offered but in the tēple of Hieruſalē, this is ſacrypfyced in eche churche. Yea the mooſt learned catholiques cānot endure thee foꝛeſayde Pꝛophecye ſhulde be ſo takēas it concerneth thee quyte aboliſhement of theyꝛ Maſſe ſacrypfyce. Foꝛ that they beleue that as Chꝛiſtes churche is euerlaſtable ſo theyꝛ ſayde ſacrifice alwayes endureable. It is

expꝛeſſy

expressely wrytten in, xiiii. of thee Acres of the Apostles (say our catholiques) that they sacrificed to thee Lorde. Therfore by al semblaunce they sacrificed his body and bloud. What a mistashioned argumentation is this? The Apostles sacrifyced to the Lord, ergo they sacrifyced hys body & bloud. Could they sacrifyce nothing but the sayd body & bloud? Wought they not preache, pray, gather almoule for the nedy and mynystre the Lordes supper? Be they not al seuerably seruiceable and acceptable sacrifyces? Bee not al so the ful executours of the same iustly named sacrifyers? Yeas verely, Then it is nothing ensuable, because thee Apostles sacrificed, they sacrificed Christes bodye and bloude. And Luke saythe not they sacrifyced

Christes

chziſtes body & bloud, but in ſim
ple they ſacrificed. Therfoz this
ſaying of luke they ſacrificed im
poꝛteth neceſſarelye no ſacrifyce
of chziſtes body & bloud, but ra-
ther of ꝓ befoꝛeſayde. That here
Eraſmus nameth ſacrificinge, ꝓ
old trãſlatoꝛ termeth miniſtring
Chziſoſtome takethe it foꝛ pꝛea-
chinge, ſo dothe Eraſmus alſo.
The greke woꝛd ſaye ꝓ Pariſiãs
betokeneth to execute & miniſter
a publique office, & it is here ta-
kẽ to pꝛeache gods goſpel. Thus
the Pariſiaus in theyꝛ annotaci
ons vpõ the new teſtamẽt. Thus
it is euident the befoꝛe alledged
argumẽtation is both wꝛong fra
med & diſpꝛoued bothof chziſoſto
me Eraſmus & Pariſians ꝓ hed
mayntenyers of the maſſe ſacrifi
ce. Another reaſon that the catho
liques alledge foꝛ thee maynte-
naunce of theyꝛ ſacrifice is thys

The

The thyng fygured must agree wythe hys fygure. Chriſte was fygured by the paſcal lãbe, therfore as the ſayd lambe was firſt offered ere it was eaten: Euen ſo chriſte (the true lambe) was offered ere it was eaten, at his maundy. To this I anſwere after this ſorte. It is ryght certayne that ỹ matter figured & the figure both do & muſt accorde in ſome poynte, otherwyſe ther can be neyther fygure ne thing fygured: In cõſyderatiõ wherof the paſcal lãbe (for ỹ ſygneth chriſt) it muſte & dothe reſemble hym in ſomwhat & ſo it doth. For as the paſcal lãbe was ſlayne & offered, ſo was chriſt: As the paſcall lãbe (ſlayne and offered) was a meane where by the Iſraelites were deliuered frõ theyr ſlauery of Pharao, So chriſt mourdered brokẽ & offered was the meane wherwyth we be fredomed Exodi. xii

fredomed frome ẏ thraldome of our spyrtual Pharao ẏ deuyll. As ẏ pascal lambe was not onely offered but eatē also: so Christ was both eaten & sacryfyced &c. But ẏ ẏ thinge fygured shuld be throughly ordred as hys fygure in all pointes, it is neyther nedeful ne possyble Els shuld Christ haue bene offered but of others alone & not of hym selfe also. In cōsideratiō ẏ pascall lambe was so Els shuld he haue bene rosted ere he were eaten, bycause ẏ pascall lambe was not eaten rawe but rosted. Els his bones shulde haue bene brēt, for ẏ the sayd lambes were, Els his bloud shuld haue bene springled in ẏ Jewes houses as ẏ lābes was, Els he shuld not haue bene eatē whole & vnbrokē vn sufferably but by pecemele and sufferably as the lambe was Wherfore ryght as Christ is fygured

gured trueli by the pascal lambe
notwithstãding his foresayd dis=
agremẽt therwyth: Euẽ so thou=
ghe christ is fyrst eatẽ & thẽ sacri=
ficed yet ẏ is none hinderãce why
the sayd christ shulde be fygured
by the pascal lãbe, Now to ẏ next
reason ẏ is adiudged to enforce
for the masse sacrifice. Ye cannot
drinke of the lordes cup & the de=
uils to? Ye cãnot be partakers of
the lordes table & the deuils also
Here S. Paul cõpareth the par= 1. Cor. 10
taking of the lordes supper with
the communion of the meates of
fred to the deuyls, whych thinge
certaynly he wold neuer haue do
ne oneles he demed christes body
and bloud fyrste to be sacryficed
ere thone is eatẽ thother dronkẽ
as the meates dedicate to deuyls
be. For els ẏ hys cõparison were
nothig semblable ne formal. To
thys is myne answere: Paules
sayd

sayd comparison betwixt ẏ sayd body and bloud, and the meates and drinkes consecrate to deuils consisteth only in mutual receipt and comunyng of them, and noo thing at al in the sacrificing of ẏ same. Therfore he mencyonethe only ẏ partaking and not theyr offredge also: I meruel me moch what our catholiques meane to auouche thee before mencyoned comparyson not to be formall wout it implied the offredge also both of the sayd meates and drinkes. May not two thiges be iustly compared togethers and ẏ but in one symple matter? Doo they not know that eche comparison halteth and in some matters discordeth? Yf they wyl haue ẏ here tofore named cōparison so throughly answerable & sembleable in all condicions: Thē it is to be argued after thys posycyon, and

decree

decte that whē soeuer chrystes bo
dy is eatē, hys bloud dronkē and
that accordingly e, yet they staine
and embrue vs in consyderaty ō
the vniage meat and drinke, eatē
& drōkē so do. Thē do they alway
displease god, for that ỹ meates
and drinkes offered to ydols so
do, Thē they be grossely sensybly
and sufferably eatē and dronken
for ỹ the meates and drinkes of-
fered to Idols be after that sort
both eatē and dronkē. Al thees in
cōuenīēses be no lesse gatherable
of the forelayd comparison then
that Chrystes bodye and bloude
ought to be sacrysyced. In consi
deratiō the ydol meate and drin
ke be offred. Is it not in expresse
wordes in Paul. v. to ỹ Hebrues
(save our catholiques) that eche
Bysshop or preest takē out of the
nombre of mē is ordeined for mē
in those thinges ỹ do appertaign

to

to god that he shuld offre gyftes
& sacrifices for synne: whereby it
is full open that oure prestes do
offere a sacrifyce for oure synne:
What can that bee but Christes
body & bloud: Fayn wold our ca
tholiques haue theyr masse sacry
fyce to be authorysed & founded
vpon gods wrytten worde, but it
wolde not be. I beseche the what
enforceth ỹ alledged text of Paul
to the mayntenyng of prestes sa-
crifice: Verely nothing at al. For
why it talketh only of the Aaroni
cal order of priesthode, as it doth
well appere by this the after say
inge of Paul, let no man take vn
to hym honoure (he meaneth the
forsayde priestehode) wythoute
he bee called of God there too as
Aaron was, and compareth thee
office of thee sayde priestehode
wyth Christes as it is ryghte e-

uydent

uydente by thys thee nexte after speache whych begynneth in sort thus. Euen so lykewyse Chryste etc. And he speaking but of the leuiticall priesthode oughte in nowyse too be vnderstande of oure masse presthode, according to the generall rule. Eche man sayinge must be takē after the entended & entreated matter. Well though ye foresayd allegatiō of Paul were to be construed of oure Christian priesthode & of our christian priestes. Howbeit, it oughte so too be takē that it implieth nomore one christiā thē another, nomore ye spiritual thē the leamē, notwithstanding some be ecclesiastical ministers) whyche other be not) according to this saying of peter, ye be a kingly presthod, But beyt ther be certayn allotted & chosen to a special sort of presthode, whyche the remnaunte of Christians, be not allotted to, Jet shuldthe here

i. Pet. ii

tofore alledged ſcripture argue nothig for thē. By reaſō it entreateth of ſoch preſtes who ar wonted to offre not one gyft, but many & diuers, not one ſacrifice, but ſondre, and thē to the ful contentation of ſyn, oure made prieſtes offre but one gyfte, yf they offer that but one ſacrifyce and not dyuers, and that not to the ſatiſfaction and purging of ſynne but for a thankeſgeuing, as our Catholiques thē ſeluen now at the laſt acknowledge. Yet thee ſayde Catholiques replye for ther ſaid ſacrifice in ſort thus: Chriſt ſayd to his apoſtels (as Luke. xxii. maketh hereof report). Thys do for my remēbraunce, which thys his ſaying autoryſeth thē to ſacrifyce chriſtis body and bloud as he him ſelue had thē done at his ſupper. This theyr replicatiōns nothing effectual or true, Was not

S

S. Paul an apostle not of ỹ baſeſt but hyghest sort: howbeit he dyd not vnderstād the sayd sayinge of christ after that sort. For he spoke the very selue same to ỹ vnprestes Corinthiās, and ỹ not of his owne hede, but by the motion of the lord. I haue (sayth he) receyued of the lord, which I haue delyuered you, wherby it doth wel appeare that it is not onely e. Paules, but the lordes also & consequently al his apostles mynde, that thys hys sayinge do thys in my remēbraunce, is spoken aswel to the vnprestes as to the prestes christians. By reason whereof yf thone be through the sayd speche autorysed to sacrifyce christis body, the other is in lyke maner. If the one be not, the other sorte can not be: In respect wherof our Catholiques acknowledging the vnprestes not to be autorised throu-

1. Cor. 11.

ỹ sayd speach auctorysed to sacri
ficechristes bodi, thother is in ly
ke mãer. If thone benot thother
sorte cane not bee. In recspecte
whereof oure Catholyques ac-
knowledgynge thee vnpreysted
not to bee auctorysed thoroughe
the aboue alledged scrypture to
offre Christes bodye and bloud:
muste no remedye graunte thee
preystede not to be lycenced by ỹ
sayd scripture to sacrifice ỹ same
Thys partecle thys in thys chry
stes sayenge thys dooe in my re-
membraunce as it is a ꝓnoũe re-
latyue so demonstratyue, therfor
reporteth declareth & respecteth
hys antecedent, whyche was not
to sacryfyce hys body wherof he
forspoke neuer word ne did anye
thing cõcernig ỹ same but onely
ỹ thãkful receipt & eating of his
body & drynkyng of hys bloude,
ther purposeli mẽcioned. Which
ymplye

ymplie no maner sacrificing of ȳ
same at al, This is graũted of all
mẽ aswell of the catholiques as ȳ
protestantes as a trueth most vn
doubted, ȳ ȳ laye & vnprotested mã
receaueth the cõmunyon vnwor=
thely, what tyme soeuer he take it
not recording therwyth the pryce=
ous death of the lorde. But howe
could the sayd mã receaue ȳ sayde
cõmunion vnworthely for his re=
ceyppte therof wythout myndeful=
nes of christes passion & death, yt
for to so take it, were not a punish
able defaulte? For why the vnwor
thenes herein issueth from ỹnne
alone. But how were it synne, yt
it were not directly repugnaunte
agaynst Goddes oppen commaũ
demente? For there is noo synne
whych is not a breach therof. But
what commaundemente is there
for the laye men to remẽbre christ=
tes deathe at theyr receyppte of

of his supper, yf thys do in my re
mēbraunce be not it, yf it touche
thē not? Certaynly none. By rea=
son wherof nedes must we reco=
gnise & acknowledge eyther that
the vnprested ꝑsons receyue not
vnworthely the sayd sacramente
when they take it in forgetfulnes
and sylēce of christes passion, whi
che is nothing graũtable, eyther
els that this saying of christ, this
do in my remēbraunce cōcerneth,
& chargeth ẏ sayd persons aswel,
as the prestes, whych is ryght cer
teyn. In cōsideratiō wherof, this
do in my remēbraũce purporteth
not to sacrifice christ in hys remē
braunce but to recorde & declare
opēly hys death (as Paul sayth)
11. who exponeth the sayd saying, in
thys wyse. As oft as ye eate thys
bread & drinke thys cup, ye shall
show the death of the lorde tyl he
come. Yet are not oure Catholi=
ques

ques contented but further they
pzocede in theyz replial: We ha
ue an aulter wherof they may not
eate whych serue thee tabernacle:
Here saye they. Paule meanethe
thus. They who kepe the ceremo
nyes of Moyses lawe haue none
authozitie to eat of chzistes bzead
hys very body cõsecrated & offe-
red in sacrpfyce on the aulter wht
che we chzistẽ men haue set vp in
our tẽples. If Paul had notmea
ned this he wold haue made noo
mẽtion of an aulter whych is ma
de foz sacrifice to be offered ther-
upon to God. See (good reder)
how toule decepued be the herfo-
re named perlõs. Is it not ryght
euydẽt that Paul speaketh of an
eateable aultar: We haue an aul
tare (saythe he) wherof they maye
not eate, & not of thee masse stone
aulter whych is not eatable. If ỹ
sayd aultare were to be takẽ foz a

stone aultar Then were they who trusted in the ceremoniall lawe in better case then we Christians be For that they moughte not, wee must eat ẏ sayd aulter, Thē shuld Christes body & bloud thone haue bene eatē thother dronking in Paules tyme at the aultare & not
1. Cor: 10. at the table, Thē wold Paul haue termed the eatynge place of thee lordes supper not the lords table, but the lordes aultar, Then wold not the Apostles haue gone from
Act: 2 house to house to mynister the cōmunyon, for that there was none aultare. Then do oure mynystres trespace who exhibite & mynystre the sayd commnnion to the dyeng men at home, were wantethe an aultare, Christe is onlye the eatable aultare heretofore especifyed, whom bothe we must and do eate vnto lyfe euerlastynge otherwyse spyrytuallye dead for euer, as we

may/

maye learne the same in Jhon: vi
The which christ is named an aul
tar, for ỹ vpō him alone we laye &
powre our spiritual sacrifices na
mely our prayers & brokē hartes,
otherwise not acceptable to god ỹ
father according to this saying of 1 Pete: 2
Peter. Offer vp spiritual sacrifi-
ces acceptable to god for Jesu chri
ste sake: By christ sayth Paule we Hebre: 13
offer ỹ sacrifice of prayse alway to
god, ỹ is to wete the fruytes of tho
se lippes which confesse his name
Thys is the laste argumentacion
of them that be deduced & ketched
out of the scripture which seme
th any thing forceable for the prest sa
crifice. As touchig thys place of
Mathew. v. When thou offerest a
gyft at ỹ aultar. etc, Notwythstā-
ding it mēcioneth expresli both an
aultar & an offredge: Howbeit for
so moch as it was thē vttered whē
the ceremoniall lawe of Moyses
stode in hys wounted effecte and

and force whych cōmaunded thē both to be vsed, and spokē also to thē, who were thē obliged & bounde to obey the sayd law: For ẏ thē the new testamēt was not ful institute & ratified: It enforceth nothyng at al for like offring & aultare to be frequēted & vsed emōg vs christians. By reason the here tofore named law is through the ordinaunce & establyshment of ẏ new testamēt vtterly abandoned & repeled. In that sayth Paul he saythe a new Testamente he hath abrogate the old. And as touchig thys sayinge of Paule. And they which wayte at the aultar ar partakers of the aultar, it importeth nothing at al in ẏ behalfe of masse sacrifice, wherof ther is no mēcion made. It is but the fourmer parte of a symplitude fetched out of the ceremonial law of Moyses and meaneth thys. As in moyses

law

law, whoso serued the aultare (as thee Leuytes dyd) lyued thereby: Ryght so (now in the new Testamēt) who so preacheth the gospell shal haue hys lyuinge through ỹ preachment therof. For Paule in his the alledged terte & others incidente hereto, endeoureth hym selue to argue a lyuelyhode to be deiu|e payable to the gospel, preachers of theyr auditours for ther euangelical preachemēt. Consyder (dere reder) wel the entier and full sayinge of Paule, & you shal easely perceaue he meaneth thus Do ye not (sayth he) vnderstande how that they whych minister in the tēple haue theyr fyndynge of the temple, And they which wayt at the aultar ar partakers of the aultar? Euen so, also (note the applicatiō of the fourme two symilitudes) dyd the lord ordeyn that they whyche preache the gospell,

shulde

shuld lyue of ẏ gospel. Yf the for-
mer part of ẏ sayd symylitude we
re so to be takē ẏ it shuld meane ẏ
now ther be certen ministers who
shuld serue ẏ aultare, it is to wete
shuld masse it, then the gospel prea
chers shuld not masse it at al. For
that by Paules doctryne to serue
the aultare & to preache be soun-
drye and seuerable offices and mi
nisteryes, which thyng accordeth
not with our catholique doctrine,
which teacheth ẏ the gospell prea
chers must masse it also. But wat
meane I to be so moche in the soy
lyng of these two last recited scryp
tures, whych yf they had bene any
thynge effectual for the proufe of
the prieste sacryfyce, as the before
alledged seme, Mayster doctour
Smythe wold haue pleased them
wyth in hys boke made for the de
fence of thee sayde sacryfyce, as he
hathe doone thee remnaunte, and
not

not in the margente therof. Thus haue I at full both declared and argued that Chriſtes bodye and bloud ought not to be ſacrifyced of the Maſſers in theyr maſſe, eyther to clenſe our ſynne, eyther els to thanke and ſerue god wythall, and that the reaſons whych the catholiques deduce out of the ſcripture to the mayntenaunce therof enforce nothing for the ſame. But ſaye oure catholyques the auncyente and holye Doctours as Auſteyne Chriſoſtome and others expreſſely auouche thee Lordes bodye and bloud to be offered of the miniſters, whych thyng they wold neuer haue affyrmed oneles they were offered ſo in deede, and that accordynge too Gods worde In dede it is full certayne that the ſayd Doctours auouche both thee LORDES bodye and

hys

and hys 'bloude to bee sacrificed but not after oure Catholiques meaninge. For why they vnderstand by the sacrifyce of christe s body & bloud done by the minister only the resembleance and memorye of the true & bloudy sacrifyce of the sayd body & bloude which is the cõmunion & not any real & true sacrifice of the same executed by the priest as the catholiques mistake thé. We ofte vse to saye(sayth Austen to bonifacius)whẽ easter approcheth nygh̃e that to morow or the next daye is the lordes passion & yet it is many yeares sythe he suffered and ỹ passiõ was neuer but ones: And vpon ỹ sonday, we saye this daye he dyd agayn ryse, howbeit, it is many yeres sence he rose: Now is there no mã so folisshe to reproue vs as lyers, for so saying, because we name those dayes after the similitude of those, in whych the-

se matters were done, so that is
called the same daye which is not
the very same daye but by course
of tyme lyke it. And it is sayde to
be done thee same daye throughe
meane of the celebration of the sa
crament whych is not done the sa
me daye, but longe tofore. Was
not christ oues sacrificed in hym
selue? & yet in the sacramēt is sa=
crificed for the people not onelye
eche ester holy day, but eche day?
And he lieth not who beinge de=
maunded answereth he is offered
For yf the sacramentes haue not
some sembleaunce of the matters
wherof they be sacramentes, they
were noo sacramentes at all. Of
this sembleaūce oft they take the
names of the thynges by thē sig
nyfyed. Lo there it dothe full wel
appere that by Austeynes mynde
the sacramente of christes body &
bloud is so named thee sacrifyce
of thē both as esterday is named

the day of the lordes resurrection
& good frydaye his passyon daye.
But the sayd dayes benot termed
fszy the lord in very dede ag ayne
ryseth in thone & resuffreth in tho
ther, but by reason his passyon in
thone hys resurrectyō in thother
is repzesented & signifyed. Ther-
foze the cōmuniō is called ỹ sacri
fice of ỹ lordes body & bloud not ỹ
they be sacrificed verely i ỹ same,
but in cōsideracion theyr sacrifice
is bothereco2ded & resembled in ỹ
sayde communion oz sacramente.
The celebzating of the cōmunion
sayth Ekius in the tenthe chap.
of hys fourmer boke of the masse
sacrifice (dedicate to the kynge of
Pole) foz ỹ it is an ymage resem-
bling Chzistes passiō (ỹ true sacri
fice) may be named alway a sacri-
fice. As Austeyn sayth to Simpli
cius, Images ar wonte to be cal-
led by ỹ names of those thynges
wher

wherof they be ymages, Exãple, whē we vieu & beholde a paynted table oz walle we saye thys is Cicero, thys is Salust, thys Cesar, Here we se both by Austeyne and Ekius iudgemēt the communyō is named a sacrifyce of Chzistes body and bloud foz that it is a resemblēaunce & ymage of the same sacrifyced. By reason whereof nedes it must argue, as the ymage of a thynge is not thee thynge selue: as a paynted man is no mā in dede, as Cesars ymage is not Cesar ne Salustis Salust selue: So thee Masse oz Communyon beynge but an ymage and memorye of ỹ true sacrifyce of chzistes body and bloud is not thee verye true sacrifice of thē bothe, And as the cōmunion is named the sacrifice of ỹ fozesayd body & bloud, in consyderatiō the sayd sacrifice is ther in both recozded & resembled

ryght

Ryght so the ministring & celebra
ting of the sayd cōmnnion is vpō
lyke respect termed ẏ sacrifyinge
of christes bodye & bloude. Thus
meaned our forefathers by the sa
cryfice & sacrificing of the sayde
body and bloud. Now to the last
matter incident to the masse sacri
fice whych is the worshippe & in=
stans of whole christe bothe man
and god, in & vnder the fourmes
of bread and wyue. A dede nolesse
vnsytting & repugnaunt too the
Euāgelical truth thē the premis=
ses be. The pryue masse worshyp
pers holde opynyon that Christe
ought of congruēce to be honou=
red & prayed after the consecrati=
on as beyng in the prestes hādes
for that he is thē there bothe god
and mā & so ther no lesse honoura
ble & prayable thē in heauē, But
thys theyr argumentacion is no
thing

nothig dialectical or formal. For ȳ the presence of Christ in a place importeth not the honour & prayeng of him in the sayd place. Is not god the father essencially in eche creature? Yet he is reuerenced & sollicited, but as resident in heauē & not in hys creatures. Is not the holy ghost in eche faythefull person? Howbeit no mā worshippeth him as present in ȳ faithful, but as in heauē. Christ is present in eche religiouse assēble assembled faythfully in his name, ȳ notwithstādig noma doth honoure, & pray vnto hym as respyant in the religiouse assemble but in heauen alone. Is he not as god eche wher & consequētly at the masse? Howbeit noman adiudgeth hym there to be worshipped & called vpon, yf hys body were thēce vtterly absēted, The experiēs wherof is playn in that part of the masse

Yt that

that forgoeth consecration. Why thē shuld hys bodely presence enforce vs to honour & sollicite him in the sayd masse? For his body is not honourable ne prayable merely of it selue but in respect of hys godhedde personally alyed & coupled therwyth. Christ both god & mā w̄ his father & the holy goost is present at ỹ baptisme of faythfull infantes where they become enbodied & incorporate therto, it is to wete where they eate his body & drinke his bloude as reallye as we do at his supper: Howbeit no mā worshippeth eyther hys body as present at baptisme ther no lesse presēted thē at his supper, eyther els his godhed, ether for his own or for ỹ presens of his said body, Why thē shuld ether his body be honoured as present in ỹ masse after the consecration or els thee presēce therof cause vs to honour

hys

his godhed in the same, ther other wyse vnhonourable: As in ỹ olde testament (as we learne in the. vi. of Dantel) the Godlye fathers in theyr exilemēt wādering in farrē cōtreis farre frō whom dyd in all theyr prayers made vnto god dyrecte bothe theyr hartes and theyr eyes toward Hierusalē, & wher so euer they cam, dyd sollicite god as inhabitant in ỹ same: ryght so we being as pelgrimes i this worlde, exiled as were from heuē our Hierusalē and natyue countrie where god dwelleth must honour & pray vnto hym alway as resyāt in that heauēly Hierusalē & not els wher It is wrytten in the canon of thee most worthy counsayl of Nyce in sort as foloweth. Let vs not grosely beholde the breade and cuppe proposed & set before our eyes but in faythe, consydere thee lambe of

of god in that hys sacred table w
our myndes eleuate and vplifted
Here we se the most worthy cõsayl
inhibiteth & diswadethe vs from
gaysing & tootinge vpõ the bread
and wine, aduertising vs in faith
to respect christ in his supper, ha-
uing our myndes erected vp into
heauẽ. In case the said cõsayl had
estemed it sitting & leyful to wor-
shyp the bread (as the most parte
of the lealtye, I had almost sayde
of the clergie to doth, an ydolytre
detestable), or christ in the breade
(as in maner all christiandõ doth
a lamẽtable case) it wold nothaue
forbiddẽ vs to toote vpõ the bred
& aduertised vs to vplift our har
tes into heauẽ. Dothnot the prest
him selue at his masse saye a little
before eleuation or sacringe. We
haue our hartes aboue to ꝓ lord.
How eyther ought or can christ be
reuerenced & oncalled as present

in

in the sacringe yt we, as ỹ masse
& quere doo singe, haue & ought
to haue (throughe the decre of the
church) our hartes & eyes two (for
where oure hartes be there muste
our eyes be fastened also) aboue
erected vp into heauẽ to the lorde
for yt he were to be considered &
honoured in ỹ masse, thẽ we shuld
haue our hartes beneth & not abo
ue downward & not vpward to ỹ
lord, thẽ we shuld at that instante
worshyp hym in the prestes hãdes
& not in heauẽ. Christ prescribing
vs an exacte trade & perfyt forme
to praye wythall, enioyneth vs in
the same to instant & on call God
the father in heuẽ wher he him sel
ue is resydent on hys ryghthande
(as Paule sayth) & not els where
notwithstãding he be eche where,
Our father sayth christ whych is
in heauẽ, he sayth not whych arte
eche where. In respect wherof

bothe ẏ father & ẏ sonne be to be
worshipped & praied to ĩ heauẽ a
lone & not els wher, For to praye
otherwise (saieth Cipriã) thẽ chri
mathe.15 ste tought vs is not only an igno
raũce but a vice also, syth he say-
eth why do ye infrig & break god
des iniunction purposely to esta-
blesh your tradiciõ. Chrisostome
ĩ hys exposiciõ vpõ ẏ lordes pray
er writeth as foloweth, where as
Christ saieth God is in heauẽ he
doth not by ẏ his so saiẽg cõclud
& hemẽ hĩ ther but ẇ draweth bĩ
who makethe his praier to hym,
frõ ẏ earth & fastneth him ĩ heauẽ
Itẽ in his homely vpon the sayde
prayer he wryteth after thys forte
Se where ye cal vpon the father,
verely in heauen vpon considera
tion whereof we crye at thee vieu
of thee sacryfyce, oure hartes abo
ue, where oure confessyon is boun
de, lette oure hartes bee represen-
ted

leted. Hytherto Chrisostome who in these hys saynges that Christ is not to be honoured & prayed to in the earth & so not in ỹ massinge place (apart therof) but in heauen Further cã ther be made to god at any tyme an effectual prayer with oute an vplyftinge of oure hartes, vnto hym: No verelye. Why thẽ pray we to christ in ỹ masse sacring: Wher cã be none vpliftige but a downliftinge of our hartes. In so moche as the places where christes supper and the masse, bee celebrate (as al other places vnder heauẽ) be beneth & not aboue. Austeyn in ỹ behalfe of the premisses writeth, super lectionẽ euãgelii cõ fiteor tibi pater etc, in sorte thus, Faythfull perfetly know where & whẽ it is sayd, let vs rẽdre thãkes to ỹ lord our god. For nomã rẽdereth thãkes to the lord, who hath not his hart vpward to the lorde. Note, this he sayth not who hath

his hart downward but vpward, beneth but aboue, dyrected but erected, in the earth but in heuē to the lorde. Dyd not christ selue al waye pray to hys father his eyes erected vp into heauen, as it appereth in Jhon. xvii. Why thē do we not directe our prayers to the Crinite, not as beynge here there or els wher, but in heauen alone? But here it is obiected ẏ manye dyd worshyp & instante Christ as beyng seably conuersant emonge
mathe. 8 thē, namely Thomas Peter & the leprouse personne & therefore wee may in lyke maner honoure hym and on call hym in the masse or cōmunion. To this I answere, albe it christ was worshypful & prayeable as beyng emonge vs, whyle he was sensiblye cōuersaunt with vs: By reson he as god & mē was thē seable emong vs & vnassēded to heauē: Now beit for so moch as he is now become both vnuisible

emong vs, & resydēt in heauē, on
hys fathers ryghthād, he is both
honourable & prayable but i heuē
alone & not in ỹ erth, & consecrate
bred & wine, ffor whi to worship hi
in vnder or before ỹ sayd bread &
wyne: is to worshyp ỹ same bread
& wyne. As to worship god in vn=
der or before an ymage is to reue
rence thee ymage selue, whych is
an vnsufferable ydolatree & allo
disalowed by ỹ kynges maiesties
proceding. Christ is truth spirite
& the body, as Paule sayth, In re
spect wherof he is not tobe honou
red moche lesse called vpon, in or
vnder shadowes & carnal thiges
soch as the bread, wyne, pyxe & o=
ther earthlye thynges be. But in
spirite & veritie wythoute fygure
shadowe or any other carnal thin
ge as he hym selue sayth in Jhon
iiii. The Catholyques thē selues
graunte it ydolatre to worshippe
christ body vnder ỹ bread, yf ther

Jonn:4
Collos:2.

were remaynyng the substance of the sayd bread, why than worshyp we the foresayde bodye vnder the bread sythe as I haue heretofore argued the bread substance is not altered. Wel thoughe it were, yet why shuld it not be ydolatre to honour christes body vnder the accidental and outwarde fourmes of bread: For in thys maner as well the accidētes of bread be worshipped as in thother thee substaunce therof. Now doth he show (as the father and the holy ghost do) his glory & maiestie but in heauē alone, notwithstāding he be eche where. In respecte wherof he is to bee adored & sollicited in heauē alone and not els where: For honoure & prayer import the presence of his glorye and maiestye wherethey be exhibited to hym And as a king renoūceth to be honoured as a king where he dyssymuleth hys person

ags

age and maiestye royall. Ryghte so Chriſte dyſſymuling hys Maieſty renoume & godly perſonage here emong vs refuſeth to be reuerenced & called vpon as hee is amongeſt vs. He is as meate receaued & eaten & as drinke taken and dronken at hys ſupper: and thee maſſe alſo (yf he be ther receaued at al). By reaſon wherof he is to be honoured and oncalled nether in the one ne in the other, bycauſe meat and drinke be nether honoured ne inſtanted. Thus it appeareth euydēt ȳ the worſhyp & praying to chriſt at the maſſe, hys ſupper or els where, beaue exempted is diſſonante to the ſacred ſcripture worthy counſayll auncīēt doctours good reaſon & the nature & c'nditiō of true prayer and ſo diſcommendable. But here wolſome laye God is too be honoured and prayed to in all places and ſo conſequentlye in the prieſtes handes

at the eleuation or els where. To this I answere notwithstanding we ought to honour and sollicite god eche where, howbeit our prayers & worshippes made vnto him here or ther must tende & be directed to him as inhabitant & resiant in heauē & not as here ther or els wher in the earth. Why then wol some say doth Austeyne ye worthy clerke wryte to the contrarye? He sayth nomā eateth christes flesshe onles he fyrst worshyppeth it and synneth it, he worship it not? Wel though Austeyne saythe Christes must be worshipped, yet he gayn sayth not me, because he sayth not nomā eateth christes fleshe wout he worship it as in his supper or ye masse in or vnder the bread, but in symple without any soch lyke glose worshippeth it. Yea though he were to be vnderstand to talke of soch worship whych implieth the

honour

honour and instaunce of the sayd
flesshe. By reason he maketh noo
clere mẽtion wher the same shuld
be worshypped, he is to be taken
to entreate of ỹ worshipping of ỹ
before mẽcioned flesshe in soch pla
ce wherein it is not doubted but
certenly knowẽ it is worshipped,
ỹ is of heauẽ and not of anyearth
ly place: But Augustyn meaneth
by ỹ worshipp ig of christes flesshe
no soch worshippe as, honourtng
prayinge crowchinge or knelinge
therunto, but only the worthy re-
uerent and holsome receyppte & ea
ting of the sayd flesshe. For the ho
nour due and requisite to the said
flesshe or sacramẽt therof, is to re-
cepue thẽ as christe instituted thẽ
to bee receaued, ỹ is to wete wyth
pure fyeth clenied conscięce wyth
vnfayned repentaunce charitie &
thankesgeuing wt ful desyre and
purpose to be fedde wyth christes
flesshe

flesshe to be therbye mortefyed too
fyn & sanctified, to be enbodyed to
chryst & not to crouch beforeȳbred
to his flesshe or to worshyp inuoca
te & sollicite him as presente in or
vnderȳbred. The ryght vsage of
gods word & his sacramētes is re
cōpted theyr due honour as theyr
abusion dishonoure. The worde
Baptisme & ablolution throughe
meane of true & obedient faythe, &
clensed consciēce be condignely &
accordingly receyued wout ether
crouchyng or kneling eyther wor-
shippinge or prayinge to God as
present in ȳ same. So thee lordes
supper is worthely & ryghtely ce-
lebrate & receyued wyth oute thee
forelayd crouche worshyp & instā
ce. Thus haue I at full spokē of ȳ
fyrst part of themasse, Now to the
secōd whych cōsisteth in ȳ receypt
of the lordes supper whych wether
it bee in very dede as it is named

ſe happely may be wel doubted vpon. Yea as me ſeameth it is not in dede. For ſyth at the preuy maſſe ther is none to ſuppli ȳ roumth & office of chriſt in miniſtring the ſupper it cānot be the lordes but ȳ prieſtes ſupper. For wout chriſte or his miniſter his ſupper cannot be made ne diſtribute. Wythoute chriſtes wordes touchinge the inſtitution of hys ſupper be duelye reported at the receipte of the bred & wyne ther cannot be his ſupper. Now then can the maſſe ſupper be the lordes: ſyth ther wanteth hys mynyſter, who ſhulde reporte the ſayd wordes: Yt the prieſt preſume to pronounce them they be the prieſtes and not chriſtes. for that they be the wordes not of the gyuer whyche is Chriſte, but of thee taker whyche cannot be he. Yf it were thee Lordes ſupper that the Prieſte taketh at hys Maſſe he

ſhulde

he shuld receyue it of the lord and not of hym selue. But how can he possibly receyue it of the lord, sith ther is none present to exhibit the priest it in christ name? But some wol saye the priest may supplye ỹ person, both of the institutour exhybitour & receyuer of thee masse supper, therfore it is ỹ lordes. Yf thys ỹ is obiected were true, then mought one baptyse hym selue, assoyle hym selue, conkyrme hym selue, marrye hym selue, annoynt hym selue, whych no mã be he neuer so catholique wol graunt, By reason as thei be thought also to be institute of christ so they must all be executed in hys name & 'auroꝛite Which cãnot be, whẽ ther is none to supply his roume. For the receyuer of thee premisses cannot possibly play both the part of the geuer and of the taker. By reasõ

they

they be twoo seuetal persons. To this the catholiques also condisce de as moste certayn. Therfore as in the heretofore especifted ceremonies (some of thē truly but al catholiques termed sacramētes) one man alone cannot receyue thē, for want of a secōd person who shuld mynyster thē vnto him in the lordes name & autorite notwithstanding that one mā hathe vsed for ỹ receyppte of the same eche wordе requysit & behoueable therto: Right so the prest endeuouryng hym selue to receyue the lordes supper cā not receyue it without christes mi nyster an othere person ebelyde him selue, notwithstanding he reporteth all thee wordes appertey nynge to the ryght & ful institutiō of the sayd supper. For as the abo ue mēcioned sacramētes the receyuers reporte of the wordes belon ging to the cōsecration of anye of

the sayd sacramētes enforceth not the sacramētes: Exāple, his reporting of the baptisme wordes ouer him selue, in washig him selue, or hys rehersal of the absolution wordes vpō him selue, maketh nether baptisme ne absolutiō: Euē so the prest beynge but the receyuer that is to say, he who wold receaue the lordes supper, cānot through hys own report of ẏ wordes appertey ning to ẏ ful institutiō of the sayd supper, institute or cause the same Ther is no sacrament which hath not for his ordinaunce & essensiall beyng bothe hys deputed element word & cōmādemēt. Wher is ther any cōmaūdemēt, yea or sufferāce to take or institute ẏ lords supper alone? Certes not in ẏholy scripture. Can ther be instituted ẏ lordes supper wythout the due rehersall of the wordes concerninge the same? Can the sayde wordes be iust

lye

lye estemed christes not constituted as he meaned them: Noo verelye. Therfore lette the masser reporte them in hys pryuate Masse so oft as him lyste, they be not the lordes wordes. For that take ye, eate ye drynke ye, implye both a commaũdemente and a seconde person to the receypt of the Lordes bodye & bloude, and to the consecration of the sacramente of the same, Whyche bothe wante in thee Pryestes supper, and so it is not the lordes. Wherfore as it is falsly so presũptuously & blasphemously termed ỹ lords supper, But let it be ỹ same ỹ the masser takethe in hys masse, yet it is there haynouslye abused, for ỹ it is celebrate cõtrary to hys commaũdement & otherwyse then he instituted it. He bad vs seuer the consecrate breade charitablye emong vs & not eche of vs to reserue it to hym selue, and to eate vn- luke. xxii

vncharytablye al alone, as ẏ prest
Math. 26 dothe. He bad vs take & eate hys
bodye & not to worship it & vplyft
1. Cor: 10. it as the prest doth. He bad vs at
the celebratiō & receypt of his sup
per, receaue & eat hys body in his
remēbreaūce & thākfully to showe
his death emong the congregatiō
whych the priest pretermyttethe &
not to sacrifice his body & bloude
Math. 26 as the prest dothe: He bad vs saye
not only take eate this is my bodi
but also which is geuē for you (a
clause most fruyteful & nedefull)
Which the prest as vayne & super
fluouse ouerhyppethe. He bad vs
take & eate hys body for oure sel=
ues alone & not for others also in
that he cōmaundeth vs to eate it,
for nomā can effectualli eate it for
another, But the prest doth not on
lye eate it for hym selue, but for o=
thers also, both quyck and dead:
Which as it is vnpossible for him
to do

to do effectuallye so to attempt is a superstition. Can another mans eating releike myn hunger? Can hys drinkinge release my thyrste? Can another man be baptysed assoyled, prested, maryed, cõfyrmed or anoynted for me? How then can the prestes receypt & celebratinge of thee communion be myne or auayleable to me? Chrisostome vpõ the. xv. chap. of the fyrst to the Corinthians wryteth to the maynteynaunce of the premisses in sort as followeth. As one man cannot be christened for an other, speciallye beyng dead, so noman can receyue the body & bloud of christ for another namely beynge dead. Hereto agreeth Antidicagma. but be it it be so that the prest may receaue & eate the lordes supper for others, whether they be quycke or deade. Yet for as moch as he cannot possibly beleue for another (the iuste

Roma.i. man saith Paule shal lyue by his owne fayeth (it muste no remedy be that he both taketh and eateth the Lordis supper to thee dampnacyon of them, whatsoeuer they bee good or bad deade or quycke for whom he taketh and eateth ỹ same. By raſō he taketh & eateth the sayd supper for theym vnwor thelye for wante of hys beleuyng for theyme, whyche is merelye nedefull to the holsome and wor= thye receyppte and vsage of thee before mencyoned supper. Well thoughe it were so that the preyst bothe coulde at the Lordes sup= per for others, and beleue for theym also: Howbeyt in so much the sayde preyste bsyth in hys ma ssyng the sayd supper, otherwyse then Chryste hym selue instytu= ted it (as is heretofore declared) nedes muste hee receyue it bothe to hys own dampnaciō & others, bycause

Bicause (as S, Ambrose wryteth
vpō ẏ leauenth of ẏ fyrste to thee
Corynthiās) who so vseth ẏ Lor-
des supper otherwise thē he hym
selue ordened, receiueth it vnwor
thely & cōsequētly to his dāpna-
tiō as paul saith. Thus it is pla 1. Cor. 11.
ne ẏ ẏ priuate masse supper is to
be discōtynued & surcesed as blas
phemouse to God & annoyous to
the practycioners therof, and the
deuocyō and holynes, that is sup
posed to be in the vsage thereof,
is mere ydolatrye and supersty-
cion, and so both dampnable an
excheuable. Wherefore they w
deme it both reasonable and
ly, that the masser mought
it alone, whan others refus
ctlye to masse wyth hym
no man oughte to be a
and hinderaunce of an othe
uocyon, be no lesse deceyued the
thee Jewes, who adiuged theyre
condempnynge

condẽpning of the euãgelical doc
tryne & persecuting of christ & his
disciples both a sufferable & serui
ceable seruice too God, in conside
ration it was done of deuotyon.
Now to prayer the thyrde part of
the solytarye masse, whyche is for
soundrye consyderatyons blame
worthy. Fyrst for that therin those
sainctes bee oncalled as aduou=
rers & ayders who be not here pre
sently conuersant emonge vs but
ar fare soundred & distanted from
vs in place namelye in heauẽ. For
though we mought praye vnto ẏ
sayd sainctes as beyng presentlye
and conuersaunt wyth vs as wee
do one to another assembled toge
thers, howbeit for asmoch they be
farre placed frõ vs (they in heauẽ
we in ẏ earth) we ought not to in=
staunte thẽ. For why that were to
attribute and render to thẽ the ho
nour dewe and incidente to God
alone

alone, it is to weete ỹ knowledge of our hartes and the hearinge of the farre absent, In case I beyng at Cambzedge dyd desyze eyther you, eyther any mans thē beynge not pzesent wyth me, but eyther at yozke oz London to pzaye foz me, (whom otherwyse pzesent with me I mought both wel and wysely): wold not eche mā depose that my desyze bothe vaynelye and vndiscretely made of me? Bycause noo man beyng at that pzesent, eyther at yozke oz London, what tyme I pzaye to hym in Cambzedge, eyther heareth oz vnderstandethe ỹ my pzayer? Yeas trulye, How thē can our pzayers be fruyteful and effectual which be directed to the heauen sainctes who be farrer distanted oz soundzed from vs then eyther London oz yozke frō Cambzedge? But the heauen sainctes wol some saye beynge conuersant

oz

or present wyth God espye in hym as in a glasse, al the secretes & entendemētes of our hartes, & so orderly perceaue what we praye for & to whom, This sophistical cauil or obiection is nothing answerable, to Goddes worde wherin it is expressly wryttē in sorte as folow-
ii.para.vi eth. Thou alone knowest the hartes of the sonnes of menne. Howe coulde thys be veryfyed and iustifyed that god alone vnderstādeth mens hartes, yf the heauen sainctes kuowe thē also? Abrahā sayth Esaye.lxiii. knoweth vs not, Israell knoweth vs not, So maye we saye, Paule knoweth vs not, Peter knoweth vs not. For why they were asmoch pryueledged & regarded as Peter & Paul. It is wrytten in thee.ix.of thee boke named preacher, that the dead knowethe nothing any more, vpon the whyche text Hierome sayth thus. There is noo knowledge after death,

ne any sense after the dissolutyon of thys lyke. Wherfore as it is an vngodly so an vntrue sayinge the heauen sainctes knoweth our hartes not wythstandynge theyr conuersation wyth God. It was notably inhibited in the counsayl of Carthage that any saincte shulde be called vpon at thee aulter, that the prieste shuld vtter thys or lyke prayer. S. Paule or Peter praye for me, Why then contrarye both to the scripture and the sayd godly counsayl do we instant superstitiously the heauen sainctes at our massig: But ynough hereof. The seconde consyderation, why masse prayer is to bee discommended is by reason therein, it is prayed for the dead, not so moche too declare therby our charitie towarde them in wishinge thé saued (which purpose ware no lesse sufferable then charitable) as throughe our prayers too redeme them oute of pur-

of purgatory or at leſt to enleſſen
theyr paynes in the ſame. Whych
for to thynke wel done as it is an
vntollerable erroure ſo for to at-
tempte is a ſynneful ſuperſtition.
For who ſo dothe departe oute of
this world, dieth eyther in ỹ lorde
or without him, If he die without
hym thẽ incontinent remedyles he
is condempned. For wythout chriſte
ther is no mercy to be achyued
2. Cor. 1. or hadde, al promiſſes ſayth Paul
be in chriſt, yea and amen. But yf
he die in the lord he is both bleſſed
and enfranchiſed from al trauayl
as S. Jhõ wryteth in, xiiii. of his
reuelation. In that Johan auou-
cheth the departed in thee lorde to
be bleſſed, he doth vs to vnderſtãd
they be not payned in purgatorye
els were they curſed & not bleſſed.
In that he pronouncethe thẽ quyte
delyuered frõ al labour, he doth
vs to wete they be nomore molef-
ted

ted or tormẽted eyther in purgato
rye or els were, els shuldthei endu
re in labour, For to bee payned in
purgatorye is a greuous trauayl
Agayne whoso dieth in the Lorde
dyeth in fayth, whoso dyeth in fay
the, escapeth both deth and iudge
mẽt & so consequẽtly purgatory al
so, whych is a paynefull iudgemẽt
after our catholique doctrine. Ve Johan. v.
rely, verely I say vnto you saythe
christ, He that heareth my wordes
and beleueth on hym that hath sẽt
me, hath euerlasting lyfe and shal
not come into iudgemente but is
scaped from death to lyfe, As con=
cernynge the other dead sort as it
dyeth wythout christ so wythoute
fayth, therfore it is euerlastinglye
and so not pardonably in purga=
tory, but vnpardonably placed in
hel. Wher vpon it formally argu
eth ther is no purgatorye. Thee
dead saythe Salomon in ỹ. ix. of
his boke

of his boke entitled, ỹ preacher, ha ue nomore a reward. Which hys saying were not true, yf they mou ght be through out prayers sacry fices or otherwise deliuered out of purgatore. For they deliuery we= re a great reward. Yf any shulde come to purgatore it is very like= colourable ỹ the theefe which was hãged wt christ, shuld haue ben for a season placed & payned therein. beig soch a synful liuer as he was tyl his dieng houre, but he inconti nẽt after hys hence departure, wẽt wt christ to paradise. In cõsidera= tiõ wherof it is right certeyn that purgatore is but an ymagyned & fayned place, by reason wherof ỹ prayers & sacrifices institute to re lease & redeme soules out of the sa me (otherwise called ỹ thyrd place wherein they be payned) be bothe vayn & superstitious. The place of ỹ Machabees which ỹ catholi= ques alledge to the mayntenaũce

ij. mac. xij

of ỹ sayd place is not autẽtical or
receiued for scripture, as Hierome
Gregory Ruffinus record. The ca
nones whiche the catholiques fa=
ther of ỹ apostles, the canõs of the
last cõsayl of Leedes & Aphrycane
regestred ỹ bible bokes woutany
mẽcion made of ỹ Machabees at
al, which argueth ỹ thẽ the bokes
of Machabees were vncanonised
It is wrytẽ in ỹ heretofore alled=
ged place of ỹ sayd Machabees ỹ
Judas caused both sacrifice & pra
yer to bemade to purge & do away
ỹ syn of ỹ murdered Jewes wal, &
is in the sayd boke cõmẽded for ỹ
his so doyng which is an vndecea
ueable argumẽt ỹ the said bokes
not autẽtical or canonical. For the
leuiticall sacrifices dyd not do a=
way syn before god. It is vnpossy
ble sayth Paule to the Hebrues ỹ Hebre.x
the bloud of oxẽ & gottes shuld ta
ke away sinnes. Agayn ther be no
sacrifices or prayers commanded

of god in the behalfe of the dead.
Therfore the before mẽcioned boke is nothinge lesse thẽ canonical
In consideratiõ it approueth matters added to gods word, cõtrary
Deut, 20. to his expresse cõmaũdemẽt, Here
tucidẽtly by the way we may lerne
ỹ syth god in the old law (the tyme
of vnperfection) intoyned neyther
sacrifyce ne prayer for the dead, it
is not bys mynde that now in the
new testamẽt (the tyme of perfec-
tion) he being also now mochmore
mercyfull, thẽ before chrystes incar
nation ther shuld be made, eyther
sacrifyce or prayer for the dead to
redeme & release them wyth al (as
otherwyse vnredemed & payned)
Forther yf the forsayd boke were
throughly wrytte by the enbrethin
ge of the holy ghost (otherwise vn
ii, Petr, 1. canonised as Peter saith) thẽ this
ensuing clause shuld not haue ben
ii, mac, 12 interplaced in thende therof, And
yf

if wel, & as it is cõuenable for a fõ
rye, I wyshe the same, yt not wor-
thely, I must be pardoned, Which
wysshe or sayenge is vtterlye vn-
worthy the profession yt the holye
ghost, who sayth & wryteth al mat
ters both wel & godly, & so needeth
no pardon for the same. Yt the pla
ce of Paul whych the catholiques 1. Cor. iii
alledge for purgatorye were to be
vnderstãdẽ of the same, thẽ questi
onles were ỹ Apostles fyrst placed
& vexed in the sayd purgatory, ere
they came to heauen. For why
Paul talking in ỹ same place na-
mely of preachers auoucheth that
the fyre shal trye eche mans worke
what it is, & cõsequẽtly the apost-
les, for ỹ they were both mẽ & prea
chers. So ỹ Paule was not incõ-
tinent after yys hence departure
wyth Christe as he wysshed to bee
For to bee placed and tormented

in purgatore is not to be w̄ christ
luk.16.23 So ẏ Lazarus & ẏ these were not immediatli vpō theyr decease, thone in paradise thother in Abrahās bosome, places of pleasure, & not of wofulnes (as purgatorie is. If Christes talke in Mathew.v. concerning the extreme emprisonmēt of certayn, enforsed for purgatore thē neyther soule masses sacryfyces ne prayers could enforce anye thyng to the raunsome and deliue raunce of them, who ar payned in the same. For theyr christe swereth they shal not come oute thense, tyl they payed the vttermost farthinge. What can prayer, sacryfyce or masse auayle her, sythe christe so exactly demaundeth the full paymente of thee dett, as wythoute it the emprysoned shall not be fredōmed and delyuered? He speake the of a place where iustice is executed and not mercee, that is hel and

not

not purgatore. Oute of another sayinge of Christe in the sayd Mathew xii: oure catholiques do argue for purgatore but expuris negatiuis & therfore theyr argumentation beynge not formall is nothinge effectuall. The cause why oure aunciente wryters saye, they sacrifyce and praye for thee dead, was not to delyuer thē out of payne therby (For they sacrificed and prayed for ẏ patriarches prophetes apostles alsowho thēwere perfit already in heauē, & had nonede of theyr prayers or sacrifices) but partely too declare thereby theyr charitee towarde the hence departed, in wel wysshinge them & rendring god thankes for theyr saluation & endeles blessefulnes, partly to assure & warrāt the suruyuers at the remēbraunce of the good & blesful estate of the deceased, both of euerlastinge lyfe & bodelye re-

surrection: To sacrykyce Chrystes body & bloud eyther for the dead, or quycke, after the true meanyng of the forsayd wryters, is namely to recite & pray for the sayd persones in those our prayers which we make at the receypt of the lordes supper, called otherwyse of thē the sacrykyce of the lordes bodye and bloud, in cōsideratiō it is a resemblaūce therof & not as ỹ solle masters mistake it, to bpoffre the sayd body & bloud in bery dede to clense thee quycke: and too redeme and raunsome the deadde oute of purgatory wythal. For after thys lyfe there is no purging ne amēde mēt place. Therfore sayth Cyprīā in the fyrst treate agaynst Demetrian whē we hēce departe there is no place of repētaūce. here lyfe is ether forfetted or atteigned. Whyle we be here saith Chrysostome in hys second homelt of Lazarus we

be

haue good hope, but so soone as we shal hence departe, we shal not eyther repēt or do awaye syn. The same Chrisostome in ỹ two & twēty sermon to the people saith, ther be none occasiōs of meritingafter this lyfe. Who so (sayth Ambrose in the .ii. chap. of hys boke cōcernyng the goodnes of death) hath not here receyued remyssyō of syn shall not receaue it ther. There is no place, sayth Austeyn in hys Epistle to macedonius, of correctig our demeinour, but i this life. For after this lyfe eche mā shall haue that whych he procured to him in thys. What can be more openlye & dyrectly wrytten agaynst the poppysh purgatorye, thē the alledged auctoritees? why thē do we mayntayn purgatorie cōtrary both to ỹ scripture & aunciēt wryters? But beit there were a purginge place wherin the hence departed solles

a mockedg & blaſpheming of god is this, for the maſſer to prayt in ỹ lordes prayer let thy wyll be done in earth, & yet contrary to goddes wyl to pray for the erectiõ & accep taunce of hys ſacrifyce to ỹ great hinderaũce & derogation of chriſtes, whych was pfyted & wrought at hys maieſtyes appoyntmente: What is to take the name of god in vayne, yf ỹ be not? & ſo ſinneful What is to flocke & deſpyſe god yf that be not? In reſpecte wherof maſſe prayer is reprocheful. Now to the fourth & laſt part of ỹ maſſe named doctrine, whych in conſide ration it teacheth & ratifieth thee damnable ſynfulnes of the before mencioned partes of this ſolitary maſſe, exhorting and occaſionyng the lave people bothe to enbrace & worſhip the ſame is fautie as thet be. For the doctryne of a ſynneful matter is ſynful as the matter ſel

ue. Not onlye to ryot is synne, but the doctryne also therof & the allure to the same, To steale & to teache or exhort to steale be bothe defaultes, Too synne & to teache or moue to synne be bothe sinnefull. Euen so to pryuat masse it & to teache & motiō so todo be both defaultes exchewable, Here am I demaūded wether I suppose the epystell and golpel interplaced in the masse to be godly & approueable or no To the whyth demaunde thus I answere. The golpell & epystell yf they were not abused & misplaced were both godly and cōmendable But for so moch as thei be iserted and placed in the pryuee masse to the furniture worship and commēdation therof, and for a couerte or cloke of the vngodlynes in the same, they so misused must nedes be synneful. Meate and drinke be good and receyueable but enpoy-

soned

enpoysoned, they be nought & vn=
receaueable, & poison theyr eaters
& drinkers, as the pure poyson sel
ue doth, wherw they ar poisoned:
Right so gods worde merely of it
selue is good & frutful but abused
vngodli, displesing god & êpechig
mã, as the syn abuston doth, wher
w it is corrupted. An exãple & eui
dẽce wherof we haue both in oure
masling, & cõiuring wherin gods
words es be haynousli abused: The
re is no seruice ne worship whiche
god so highly esteemeth or so strayt
ly iniopneth to be obserued, but be
ynge misused is not only not serui
ceable & acceptable, but moch dis=
plesaũt also & hatefull to hi Bicau
se it is executed, not after but con=
trary to his wyl & therfore sinfull
and detestable before hym, who cõ
maũded only ỹ ryght vsage & not
ỹ abusage (as of al other maters)
so of ỹ premisses. Notwithstãdig

God

god cõmaũded both incẽse to be v=
sed and holy dates to be obserued,
howbeit he opẽly by hys ꝓphetes
auoucheth he hath thẽ in hate & de
testatiõ, not irespect of thẽ selues,
for he bad thẽ, but in cõsideration
of theyr abusiõ which he inhibited
I hate saithe he by his ꝓphete A=
mos, & abhorre your holy dayes &
wher ye sẽce me whẽ ye come toge
ther I wol not accõpt it. And fur=
ther by hys ꝓphete Esay. i. he say
eth thus, I abhorre your incẽse I
may not away wt your newmones
your sabathes & solẽpne dates. &c
Note this diligẽtly, god saith not
I abhorre ye for your abusyng of
the holy dayes nor he sayth I ab=
horre your abuse of ỹ holy dayes,
but I abhorre your holy dates, he
saith not I abhorre ye for your a=
busiõ of incẽse newmoones sabba
thes & solẽpne dayes, nor he sayth
I abhorre ỹ abusiõ of your incẽse
new

new moones sabathes & solemne
daies, wherby he doth vs to wete
þ he doth not only hate & detest þ
abusers & there abusage of hys
commaũded seruice & worshippe,
but þ seruice also & worship selue
as an inhybyted synne practysed
of man, & forged of þ deuyl, and
not as an honour intoyned ap-
ued, & deuysed of him, & through
his grace put in practice of man.
In consideracion wherof god na
meth þ forsaide holydayes newe
moones sabbathes not hys, but
youres, it to wete þ Jewes whom
he spooke vnto. For nothing þ is
sinfull (as eche abused mater is)
ought to be fathered of God the
Jacob.i fountane & authore not of sinful-
nes but of goodnes only. Which
matere is by þ meane of his abu-
sage not a parte only, but through
hlte faultie. A litle leauen (sayth)
1.Corin.v Paule sowreth þ whole lumpe of
dowe.

bowe. Wherby he doth vs to vn
derstãde ỹ as othere abused mat=
ters be not a part only, but entier
ly and throughly vicious and syn
ful, so the prest masse is in likema
ner as wel in his doctryne, as in ỹ
ther hys essential partes. Se the
(good reader) there is no portyon
of the poppysshe priuat masse that
both not highly displease god as
repugnant to hys wrytten worde
and derogatorye to hys honour, a
nnoy mã as noyous both to hys
body and soule: I beseech the with
all possible endeuour eschewe it &
o maner wyse, accepte it as ether
pproueable eyther els a sufferа=
le matter. If gods honour cãnot
ccasion and moue vs to the vtter
efusal and auoydaũce therof, let
s wel respecte the great benefyt
nd commodytye that redounethe
her vpon. If nether gods glorye
e our profyt, can enforce vs to ỹ

premisses

premisses, thē we be worse thā bru
tish beestes, which, though not for
godes glori, yet for theyr own pro
fyt, ar ledde willingly hither & thi
ther. We resort to ẏ church purpo
sely to serue god therin, not wyth
mās seruice, which he īhibiteth &
dislyketh, but with his own alone
which he cōmaūdeth & accepteth.
So ẏ in the cōgregatiō no maner
seruice ought to be frequēted, but
that alone which is both openlye
and truly fonded vpon gods wry
ten worde. Why then is not thee
prieste pryuee Masse abandoned
and abolished quyte out of the cō
gregatiō which is not quadrant,
but variant to the sayd word, whi
che doth not ratify & establish but
inuert & subuert the ryght institu
tion & vsage of ẏ sacramēt of chri
stes body & bloud (as is heretofo
re argued at ful). And in ẏ romth
therof why is not the communion
frequen

frequented? Is not the sayd com=
munion a new Testamẽt, as christ
selue sayth in Luke. xxii? Can a
man therfore not synfully but ley
fully alter the order therof? No ve
rely. For as S. Paule sayth it is
not leyful to exchãge mãs, moche
lesse gods wyl legacye & testamẽt.
Why thẽ doo we retеygne accepte
& vse solytare masse? Which is an
vnsitting exchange of the commu
nion (the lordes Testamẽt and le=
gacye). Is not the sayd communi
on a Sacrament of charitye and
loue? In consyderation whereof
it is not to receaued of one alone,
but of manye at ones. For charyty=
tye cõsysteth in many & not in one
alone. Why then vse we stylle thes
prieste masse? whyche is rather an
vnion then a communion and an
argument rather of hate and dis=
sention thẽ of loue and vnite. For
therin the prieste vnchartably son
dereth

Gala. iii.

fondereth hym selue from the con
gregatyon, as one seuered not in
place alone, but in harte also from
the same. It is no marueyl that ye
priest is had in great hate and con
tēptmēt emong hys parishioners
seith he so vncharitabli taketh, ea
teth, and drinketh al alone, disse-
uering and sequestring him selue
from hys accompanable parrisht
oners, lest they wold communyca
te (as charitable godlynes requy
reth) wyth hym. It is a lamētable
syght to behold the great & vntol
lerable vncharitablenes whyche
our pryuate massing prestes shew
toward theyr parrishioners. Vere
ly (as me seamethe) theyr pryuate
massyng is no smal occasyon ther
of. By reason as the communyon
engendereth orderly lowe, so thee
pryuate massynge hate in the fre-
quenters of the same: For why as
they

they be cõtrary in nature, so they be in effect & operation. Wherfore the sayd massinge is not be frequẽted of any, but is to be dissused of eche christiã. Who ought to endeuour him selue to be charitable and not vncharitable. We ought (sayth Paul) to eate al of one loke, and drinke al of one cup, we ought (as the same Paule wolleth vs) assemble togethers to the receypt of the communion, and one to take it orderly after another: These premisses cannot be accomplished and verifyed in the priuate masse, where the priest seuerally all alone hath hys looke & eateth it alone, wher ther is none assemble assembled togethers to receaue thee cõmunion, but to gase vpõ the prestes receypt & doynge, where none receaueth the sayd cõmuniõ orderly one after another, but vnorderly one alone. Wherfore thee sayde

1. Cor. 10

1. Cor. 10

1. Cor. 11

masse is to be discontinued & abã-
doned. For why he is accursed who
so teacheth eyther in woorde, dede
or toynctlye in both, another doc-
tryne in relygion, then that whych
Gala. 1 Paul learned vs, as he hym selue
recordeth the same. We muste not
do what we lyste, but what god cõ
maundethe vs, as it is wrytten in
Deuteronomy. xii. For why oure
carnall reason & entendemẽtes be
merely repugnaũt, both to his say
enges & doynges, & so displeasaũt
and hateful to him. The sense of ỹ
Roma. 8. flesche (sayth Paule) is enmytee a-
gaynst God. In case we moughte
worship god as we lyst, Why dyd
he appoynt & prescribe vs a p̃scrip
te order to worshippe him withal:
Yf we moughte sittingly honoure
hym after our wyl & fantasy: Thẽ
eche made worshyp were syttinge
and leyful, and so consequentelye
ther were none ydolatree at al, thẽ
were

were there no dyfference betwene
oures and thee Turkes, Jewes
Paynymes, Ethnikes, and other
miscreantes religion, For they be
onely differenced by Goddes wyt
ten woorde. If we moughte ordet
chzistes supper after our arbitre=
ment, then why dyd he institute &
prescribe vs a trade and order to
be obserued in the celebratiō ther=
of? Why dyd Paule reproue and 1. Cor. xi.
blame thee Corinthians for theyr
disorder & abusage of the same? Ar
not wee named chzistians for that
we ought to professe and geue ful
credence to his sayinges and prac
tyse, and embrace hys doyinges,
as followable and beleueable?
But howe doo we answere to our
name and profession in our solita
rie massing? wherin we do not on=
ly, not ensue chzistes practyse and
order, but throughly subuert and

inuerte the same concernynge the administration of his supper. Are we not called kaythful for that we ought to grounde al our religion vpon our kayth: whych kayth issueth only from Gods wrytte̅ word, as Paule recordeth, otherwyse no true kayth. But how can we be indede as we be named, yf we admit and frequente as wee doo, to thee greate and vnsufferable empechemente bothe of Christes honoure and our solles saluation, the prest preuye masse: whych is bariant to gods worde. Therfore as it is an vnkaythful, so a synneful misdede For that which is wrought wythout kayth is synne, as Paul saith: Are we not straytelye intoyned of God vtterly to abandon, & auoyd all ydolatrye: How do we observe and accomplische this his iniuncti on, whyle we enbrace and accepte the sayde masse: whych is a made

Roma. 10

Roma. 10

worshyp

worshyppe of God, and so ydolatrye. For the worshyp of any phantasye entent conceypt and ymage, or of any other matter elfe, forged of mans brayne wythout goddes wrytten word, is questionles ydolatrye: Hereto accordeth Hierome (who vpō the last of Hieremye on thys verse And they put theyr ydols in the house. etc, wrytethe in, forte thus) not only thė Judas reposed in Gods temple an ydoll ymage, whereof we rede in the fyrst of Ezechtel, but now styll in gods house (whych by interpretation is the congregatiō) or in the hart of ỹ beleuers, is placed an ydol, whēsoeuer any new doctrine is forged, and after the law adored and worshypped in the secrete. And vpon the twentye of Ezechyel the sayd, Hierome calleth the inuētiōs and deuyses of the philosopher and herytyques, the Egyptiās ydols.

Au ncient

auncient vsage in other matters of relygion semeth to be of moche force & importaūce to ỹ acceptāce & establishmēt of any soch semblable matter, but her in our pryuate masse matter the sayd vsage is no thig estemed. (To sure an argumēt I feare me of oure parcialitee in scripture matters) Was not chri-
Mat. xxvi. stes own administratiō of his supper the fyrst original vsage thereof: and so the auncientest: wherin none alone but soundrye toinctly togethers dyd communicate: In the prematiue church it was both obserued and enacted that all the whole cōgregation assēbled shuld communicate wyth thee prieste or minister, as it doth wel appere in Gracian de consecra. distinct. i. in the canon oēs, whyche is fathered of the Apostles, in thee Canon Episcopus fathered of Anacletus, & de consecra. distinc. ii. in the canon

paracta

peracta, Calixtus thus wryttethe whē the cōsecratiō is done, let echs mā thē present cōmunicate, & then who woll not to be excōmunicate. This thee Apostles enacted thys doth the Romysche churche hold & obserue. Note thys that Calixtus doth not onli declare that it is his wyl & commaūdemēt al they who be present at the communton time shuld communicate, els to be excō municate, But the apostles decree & the vsage of the Romische church also. Ther be (saith Erasmus vpō the Psalme, Quam dilecta tabernacula) who requyre in thee Masse a communion, In dede I graunt so it was instituted of Christ and so it was in thee olde tyme obserued Albert in hys boke of thee Masse misteries, recordeth it was fyrst in wont that al the togethers assembled persones in ỳ church did communicat eche day, whē ỳ could not

be obser

obſerued, it was decreed that on eche ſondaye al the hole congrega tion ſhuld communicate, whē this neyther could be obſerued, it was decreed that thryse in the yeare, at Eaſter, Whytſondaye, and Chriſt maſſe, the communion ſhuld be re= ceyued of the whole congregatiō. And whē thys could nether be ob= ſerued it was enacted that ones in the yeare the ſayde communion ſhuld be receaued of the whole cō gregation. Here we may learne of Albert that in the primatiue chur che all thee whole congregation dyd communicate eche daye toy= nctly togethers. Further in cale we wold wel and earneſtly reſpect the conſyderatyon of our repayre to the church, & what alſo is of the maſſer reported oute of hys maſ= ſe boke at thee celebration of thee communion: We moughe wel vn derſtande that the ſayd communi

on ſhulde

shuld alway be receyued of a com
paygne and not of one alone. Do
we not (I praye ye) repayre to the
churche, as to the common place,
wherein we shulde make common
prayers nothing excuting pryuat
ly but all cõmonly? Sayne Paule
auoucheth, nothinge ought to be 1. Cor. 14
executed in thee churche, but that
which redowneth to ỹ edyfying &
behoue of the whole cõgregatiõ,
so that as the churche is a cõmon
place, so the prayers therin shulde
be cõmon, so the celebration of the
communion must be common, and
not pryuate, as the wordes of the
masse canon reported after the cõ=
munion do wel declare, whych be
thees followynge. That, that we
haue receyued by the mouth, lord
graunt we may receaue wyth hart
purposely that ther may be made
vnto vs an euerlasting remedy of
the body & bloud of our lord Jesu
Christ.

christ. It is not sayd I, but we haue receaued. The priest as here so in other places saith not I but we euē whyle he cōmunicateth all alone, wherby it is gatherable ẏ masser shuld cōmunicat not seuerally alone but iounctlye wythothers. For wee importeth a multitude & not a singularitee. Some ther be who deme the solitary massing an indifferēt & consequently a sufferable matter. Wel thoughe it were so, as questionles it is not: Howbe it for so moch as we haue vtterlye renounced the Romsshe bishop w̄ al his vsurped autorite, we ought of cōgruēce abādon therwyth the pryuate masse, whych he forged & fathered, lesse we through reteygnemēte & vsage therof, be occasioned to resume & agayn enbrace the sayd byshop withal his vnsytting & pretēsed authorite. For vpō semblable consyderation, God inhibi

leui. xviii

ted the

the Israelites the vsage of the Egyptyans ceremonies, wherewith they had heretofore bene infected, albeit soūdry of thē by al lykelyhode were indifferēt. Notwithstādig (gētle reder) I hertofor haue mochwhat vehemētly gaynsayd the prieuie masse & condēned here as detestable erroneouse & blasphemous: Howbeit I trust ȳ wolste accepte this my labour, enbracing & ensuing my doctrine therin, as ensuable & credible, syth it tēdeth not to gods dishonour but to his honoure, not to thine empechemēt but to thy great comodite, not to the hinderāce & ouerthrow: but to the redresse recouery & furtherance of ȳ true masse, otherwise named the cōmunion, whych cānot be so highly estemed and so ofte frequented as of necessytye it oughte, wythoute the prieste masse be hated and detested. For bothe it and the communion cannot be iounctly regar

regarded. Whoso loueth thee one must nedes hate thother, for why they be mere contraries. But how can thee priestes masse be hadde in worthy hate: yf her abominacyon were not at full dysclosed: In respect wherof, thou seest how nedeful it is ỹ she should be both gayne sayed and condemned as herelye, and abandoned as ydolatrye.

God of hys mercye graunt vs all to learne, loue credyte and maynteyne hys truth and lyue thereafter.

A M E N.